CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY
A Quarterly of Christian Thought

Vol. 1, No. 1 April, 1955

The Purpose of the Journal: an Editorial 1

The Evanston Assembly, 1954: an Editorial 3

The Present Position and the Future Prospects of Canadian Theology — Gerald R. Cragg 5

Is Preaching Prophecy? — R. B. Y. Scott 11

Agape and Eros: a critique of Nygren — A. S. Dewdney 19

The Study of Canadian Church History — T. R. Millman 28

The Challenge of Education to the Christian Church — Hilda Neatby 35

Christianity and Communication — F. W. Dillistone 44

The John Henry Birks Collection of Ancient Palestinian Manuscripts — R. B. Y. Scott 51

REVIEWS

Oscar Cullmann: *Peter* — George Johnston 53

Paul Tillich: *Love, Power and Justice* — W. O. Fennell 55

James D. Smart: *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* — J. R. Guthrie 58

R. S. Wallace: *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* — Eugene R. Fairweather 60

John Mackintosh Shaw: *Christian Doctrine: A One-Volume Outline of Christian Belief* — J. Line 62

THE CONTRIBUTORS 64

Contributions, which should be addressed to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee, will be welcomed. MSS should be typewritten, double spaced, and proofread before being submitted. Notes should be gathered at the end of articles, with appropriate references. Publication of MSS does not mean that the Editorial Committee necessarily agrees with the opinions expressed. MSS should be received six months before the date of the issue for which they are intended. No MS will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

Books for review should be sent to the Rev. W. Morrison Kelly, St. Andrew's United Church, 117 Bloor Street East, Toronto, Ontario.

Subscriptions and business correspondence should be sent to the Secretary of the Board of Directors, 65 Queen's Park Crescent, Toronto 5. Cheques should be made out to the Canadian Journal of Theology, Incorporated, payable at par in Toronto.

The subscription rates for the CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY are $3.00 for one year, $5.00 for two years. Single issue, $1.00.

PRINTED BY UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS, TORONTO, CANADA

THE PURPOSE OF THE JOURNAL: AN EDITORIAL

WE anticipate two reactions upon the appearance of the first number of THE CANADIAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY. One will be, "Not *another* theological Journal!" The other will be, "Ah, at last a *Canadian* Journal of theology!"

We have much sympathy with the former point of view. We know only too well how impossible it is to keep abreast of contemporary theological production in books and periodicals, quite apart from the need to master the riches of the past. A moment's reflection, however, reminds us that the very volume of theological production makes journals of this sort necessary, so that by means of essays and reviews the cream of contemporary thinking may be made available to those who do not have time for highly specialized studies, and so that those interested in a particular topic may receive direction how to pursue it. To fulfil our purposes to begin with, each number will generally contain an article of each of the following types: theological or theological-philosophical, Biblical (in the Old and New Testament fields alternately), historical (relating to Canadian Church history particularly), political and social, pastoral and pyschological, editorials and book-reviews.

But someone may say that there are already a number of periodicals doing just this kind of thing. Why start one in Canada? There are several very strong reasons.

In the first place, we are not so much starting a new periodical as seeking to recover and further the achievements of a predecessor. *The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought* had a successful career for a number of years. It was only the abnormal conditions of the great depression that brought it to an end. Since that day, the population of the country has increased, her material wealth has vastly expanded, and theology has had a new birth. If the former journal could thrive so well under less favourable conditions, we must not for very shame neglect the task of producing one today.

In the second place, we belong to a nation that is rapidly achieving a splendid nationhood, progressive within and respected without. But we cannot grow wholesomely, deeply, and in a balanced way unless we develop among us all the organs of life and expression. Reflective journals are a prime necessity for intellectual and spiritual health. For this reason alone, there *must* be a Canadian Journal of theology. We are confident that every patriotic Canadian who has a sense of spiritual values will want to see our venture succeed.

In the third place, although Christianity is not Canadian but universal, and although there cannot be a Canadian theology in the sense of a Canadian system of doctrine, the eternal quality of truth is to be reached, not by seeking to abstract ourselves from our existence, but by relating ourselves to it. We are now in a period of theological quickening because the whole life of the Church has been quickened. The "eternal quality of truth" is inseparable from its here-and-now quality. Word and action condition one another. The Churches in Canada cannot take their place in the Church Catholic by being pallid reflections of the life and theology of denominations elsewhere. We shall hear the Word of God only as we obey it in the Canadian milieu in which he has put us to serve him. Let no man be affronted by the word *Theology* in our name, as if it stood for dry, abstract, unpractical discourse. To us it means the Word or Truth of God yielded as we shape our decisions in live human issues in the light of Christ. We believe that the task of clarifying that Word and those issues in the service of the Church of Christ calls for a theological journal. To that service we dedicate ourselves. Supporting groups have been formed and are being multiplied in all the Provinces to make the word *Canadian* in our title a genuine description. We desire assistance in the way of articles, suggestions, and financial donations from every quarter, and confidently appeal for a warm welcome and a large list of subscribers.

THE EVANSTON ASSEMBLY, 1954: AN EDITORIAL

THE World Council of Churches in its second Assembly held at Evanston, Illinois, in August 1954, registered a definite stage of attainment in ecumenical fraternity. Evidence for this judgement is not to be found in any striking pronouncements that emerged from the proceedings; rather, we must look at the spirit in which the work of the Council was carried on, more at what was quietly accepted than at what was deliberately announced. At the inaugural Amsterdam meeting in 1949, there was a prevailing sense of adventure into novelty. A new and momentous step was being taken, and this contributed a spirit of excitement to the proceedings, whereas, at Evanston, the existence of the Council was recognized as an accomplished achievement and the dominant mood was a certain joyfulness of spirit, one of realized fellowship rather than problematic co-operation. It would not be too much to say that Evanston brought into clear vision and evident experience the fact that a new spiritual climate for joint ecclesiastical action had been generated.

There were inevitable tensions in a series of meetings that gathered together so many churches into one place from such diversities of condition and ancestry. But the striking fact was that the emergent differences of view-point did not fall within ecclesiastical alignments. They cut across the Churches and did not become rallying-points for confessional witness. This was particularly evident in the discussions that ranged around the main theme—Christ, the Hope of the World. The theme itself might have been supposed to provide a focus for devotion rather than an arena for debate, a banner under which Christian people could unite to proclaim a message to a distracted world rather than a topic around which learned theologians could expose their differences to a perplexed audience of their fellow-Christians. There was general agreement that our Hope is in Christ, and that therefore, in face of perplexity that often darkens into despair, we can meet the future not only in undaunted confidence, but with eager expectation—that, indeed, Christians are the only people who can dare to hope in this present evil world. But, as to whether this implies that there is hope *for* this world as well as hope *in* this world, there were most acute divergencies of opinion that were never fully resolved. Nevertheless, the point to be observed is that these profound discussions, that brought to light cleavages reaching back into the entire history of our faith, did not divide the Council by *Churches*. There was no ranging into rival camps with mutual denunciations. Rather, they brought us to realize that we have all yet to enter into the fulness that is in Christ.

The real Hope that stirred the Council was its own existence, that the Body of Christ is an actuality in the world, that Our Lord is present with His people in every part of the inhabited earth, and that when they meet, they share a common faith and unite with Him Who is the Head of the Church in worship, even in communion at His table. For we had "open" communions, "open" to all baptized believers, in which we participated without strain, rather, with holy joy. We could also work together. At Evanston, it was realized that the World Council is much more than a quinquennial conference, that lines of concerted action had been undertaken and were further proposed to help the needy churches and, even more, the needy people of the world—the refugees, the hungry, the naked and the dispossessed. There is a World Church in the Churches, even if its corporate identity still awaits fulness of realization.

THE PRESENT POSITION AND THE FUTURE PROSPECTS OF CANADIAN THEOLOGY

GERALD R. CRAGG

THE launching of this new Journal invites us to reassess the present position and the immediate prospects of Canadian theology.

Some people, of course, would deny that such a phenomenon exists. It can be argued, no doubt, that the word "theology" is properly qualified only by the adjective "Christian" and that the more truly it rises to its proper stature the less susceptible it will be of more parochial designations. But setting that question to one side, one may contend that there is nothing that can properly be classified as "Canadian theology". Distinctive schools and traditions exist elsewhere; we cannot claim to have added to their number. "Continental theology" may include many emphases, but it suggests a characteristic approach to the problems of religious thought. "Scottish theology" has established its own idiom; in England, both Anglican and Free Church Schools have had their distinguishing marks. In the United States certain trends have appeared which the rest of the world chooses to regard as distinctively American. Many of these terms, of course, are inexact, and sometimes they are misleading, but they are undoubtedly serviceable. It is an inescapable fact that in Canada we have done nothing to add to their number; hitherto we have contributed nothing that is specifically Canadian. In other areas of endeavour, the increasing awareness of national unity has produced appreciable results. We have characteristic schools of painting; we have a growing literature which is marked at least by self-consciousness. Has theology lagged behind?

Beyond any question our present position is strongly influenced by our past. It is impossible to understand the existing situation without reference to the forces that have shaped our history. Prominent among these has been a kind of theological "colonialism"—a dependent spirit which has persistently looked elsewhere for leadership. Ideas and those who inculcated them could carry little weight unless they clearly bore the imprimatur of some foreign origin. It was tacitly assumed that no good thing could come out of a Nazareth as remote as ours from the fountain-heads of truth. Clear evidence of this was supplied by the character of the teaching given in our theological colleges. Till very recently our most influential centres have imported their professors from abroad. It is fortunate for us that they did; no one can calculate the benefits we have reaped from the stream of British (and perhaps especially Scottish) theologians who have come to Canada to teach. Many have remained, and in a land where most

people are immigrants at but one or two removes, they have become an integral part of the life of the country. Some, of course, have remained only till they established a reputation, and then have returned to occupy distinguished positions in the lands from which they came. At this point, two comments must suffice. This has been a Canadian, not a theological, pattern: Lord Rutherford, A. E. Taylor, Harold Laski (to take three examples from various disciplines but from one of our universities) all began their careers in Canada. It therefore indicates the basic fact that we have lacked the resources to be otherwise than dependent on other centres of thought and learning; we have had neither the men nor the intangible resources to be self-sufficient, and our debt to those who have come to our aid is incalculably great.

Our dependent status has been the consequence of the pattern of our life. At every point the frontier situation has governed the merging social forms of an expanding country. In a pioneering community there are few encouragements to academic speculation. "Winning the frontier" has been the major responsibility of all the churches, and other matters have been remorselessly thrust aside. We malign the pioneers if we think that they were indifferent to the need for study. In the days of the saddle-bag itinerants, Egerton Ryerson laid down the stern maxim that a minister who found it hard to study four hours a day had better ask himself whether he had not mistaken his calling. The practical difficulties, however, were almost insuperable, and when, at a later period, James Denney remarked on the poverty of ministers' libraries in Canada, he was pointing to the consequence of problems from which there was little prospect of escape.

Canada has had few nurseries in which potential theologians could cultivate their gifts. We have had no "country parishes" of the kind which elsewhere have provided support but have also offered leisure. Our colleges have had few junior positions in which a promising man could serve a theological apprenticeship. Over large areas, our library facilities have been remote from those who might have used them and in any case they have been deplorably weak. Opportunities to buy theological books have been negligible; we have had few book stores, fewer still that stocked serious theological works, and none in which the great religious classics could be purchased second-hand.

Lack of adequate resources, combined with the pragmatic approach natural in churches that were fighting to win the frontier regions, has kept all our colleges small and most of them weak. Some have lived a precarious life under a kind of suspended sentence. The staff has often not been equal to the task of providing a full theological curriculum, but in addition its members have been expected to assume a great variety of miscellaneous duties, administrative, ecclesiastical and evangelistic. Some gains, of course, have accrued, but theologically the losses have been obvious and severe. There has been little "learned leisure", and under such conditions an indigenous theology does not readily develop.

Nor can we overlook the background of theological thought. Fifty years ago, the Canadian churches were involved in the struggle to win freedom from the fetters of a narrow literalism. When that battle was won there was no strong theological tradition ready to assert itself. In certain of its manifestations, "liberalism" was unduly negative in spirit and largely indifferent to the heritage of historical theological development. In a country where practical demands were clamant, the attractions of the "social gospel" were obvious, and it was easy to accept them as a substitute for resolute grappling with great theological questions. Little heed was paid to the warning, "This ought ye to have done and not to have left the other undone".

It is a great deal easier to analyse the past than it is to describe the present situation or to chart the course of future development. Certain important facts, however, offer ground both for immediate encouragement and for future hope.

There is no doubt that the last few years have witnessed something approaching a theological renaissance. This has been world-wide in scope, but it has not left us unaffected. There has been a new awareness of the importance of theological issues and a new enthusiasm for theological studies. Most contemporary schools of thought can claim disciples among us and all have awakened interest in varying degrees. We may not have been originators, but we have been participants rather than mere spectators.

Moreover the foundations for further advance are obviously being laid. Recent years have brought a new awareness of the central position which Biblical studies must occupy in all theological endeavour. The exact study of the Old and New Testaments has claimed a greater measure of attention. So have the claims of the distinctive view of human life which emerges from a careful examination of the Bible. Biblical theology has its enthusiasts and they are on the increase. There has also been a keener recognition of the importance of historical studies. There have always been those who were interested in the past; the important recent development has been the growing awareness that the examination of the unfolding pattern of Christian thought can contribute immeasurably both to the understanding of the faith and to the clarifying of contemporary perplexities. A distinguished American theologian recently remarked that each passing year made him more deeply conscious of the immense importance of studying the development of Christian theology. In this realization it is obvious that many Canadians share. Nor is the philosophy of religion neglected. The evidence for this many-sided interest can be found not only in particular projects of which only our colleges are aware but in the books which Canadian authors have published in recent years. At every point examples could be cited, but where so much has been done, a catalogue would be tedious and selection would be unfair.

Certain aspects of the present situation give ground for genuine en-

couragement. In the prosperity of the country the churches have had their modest share, and this has been reflected in the much more secure position of our colleges. A new confidence has been created; in many instances staffs have been increased; progress can be reported in the slow but vital task of augmenting library resources. Canadian theology should not reside exclusively in our colleges, but for some time to come they are likely to be its most hospitable homes. As the country expands, as new districts call for new congregations and our churches face the urgent task of claiming the newest frontier (that developing around every major city), there is little prospect of securing increased leisure for the "working minister". We can at least be grateful that our colleges are in a stronger position to cultivate the quickened theological interest which has appeared.

The development of centres for post-graduate theological study is also an important feature of our present situation. Until comparatively recently a Canadian student anxious to pursue advanced studies was compelled to go abroad, simply because no facilities were available at home. Now, in two important centres, there are opportunities for academic research in the major theological disciplines. This does not mean that many of our ablest students will not continue to go abroad. Indeed, it would be disastrous if they did not do so; Canadian theology cannot risk the perils of parochialism, and the benefit of contact with other centres of theological thought is too precious to be forfeited or even reduced. But the existence of post-graduate schools does greatly increase the likelihood that many men will have some experience of post-graduate study to whom otherwise it would be denied. It should considerably extend the circle of those who have been introduced to the discipline of research. Many will not pursue the matter further, but some unquestionably will. A wider interest will create a new climate, and in it Canadian theology will have an opportunity to expand.

The future of Canadian theology will depend on the extent to which we improve the opportunities now available. We must realize, however, that the present situation is unsatisfactory in many ways, and we must alter it in the days ahead. Though our colleges have been manifestly strengthened, their resources (with few exceptions) are insufficient for the task they face. Since the development of Canadian theology is in large measure the responsibility of our professors, it is unfortunate that so few have adequate opportunities for writing and research. We have no tradition of sabbatical leave; we lack the resources which make it possible to grant periodical absence or to encourage travel. Where post-graduate facilities have been established, there has been no compensating increase in the size of the faculties, and busy men have been further overburdened. We have been deficient in benefactors, and our churches, torn between competing claims on their generosity, have not been sufficiently imaginative in their attitude to theological education. It must be borne in mind, of course, that great centres of theological learning have been established elsewhere without resources greater than those which we now command; the

facts are there, and it is impossible to dispute them. It may be that we require to cultivate a new tradition; possibly we need a clearer understanding of the simple truth that a man can produce creative work even when he lacks ideal conditions. Perhaps our theologians need to remind themselves that those who have something to say can make the time to read and write even in the face of exacting demands on their resources.

We unquestionably need to develop a new tradition among the rank and file of our ministers. Though Canadian theology may be cultivated most industriously in our colleges, it requires as wide a foundation as possible. Most ministers are very busy, but all ministers must read. We are too likely to forget that serious theology ought to have a place in the daily reading of every working minister. Years ago F. W. Faber remarked that sound theology provides the best devotional reading a man can find: when kindled, it burns long. And it is as useful in the pulpit as in the inner room. As Richard Baxter pointed out, a man can preach well on short notice only if he has a sound system of theology in his head; he might have added (and he would have added, had it been relevant) that a man can preach well at any time only if he has the same resources. We have been too apt to assume that a minister who wishes to do exact theological study must resign his charge and return to college "to take a course". Fortunately there have been exceptions, even in our overcrowded Canadian church life; but their number should be considerably increased.

Meanwhile certain practical problems which remain unsolved constitute an obstacle to our development. Both the production and the distribution of theological literature present grave difficulties. There are few Canadian publishers who are ready to accept the risks inseparable from the production of theological works. Those who will even consider producing religious books look for as wide a general market as quickly as possible, and sometimes, because they are not satisfied with a slow sale over a period of years, promptly "remainder" all surplus stock. At present the Canadian theologian is almost compelled to seek a publisher abroad, and if his work is specialized in character he has no alternative but to do so. The publishing problem is closely related to the kindred one of the sale of theological works. If Canadians had developed the habit of buying books, there might be more book stores; if there were more book stores, the facilities for the purchase of theological books might be better. As it is, a deplorable situation is further aggravated by the "book club" habit and the supine mentality which it develops. Few aspects of our national cultural life are more disconcerting than our deplorable lack of facilities for the examination and the choice of books. Our poverty is underlined by the simple fact that a small city like Oslo can boast a score of book stores all better stocked than anything that any of our major Canadian centres can boast. Our churches and our colleges have taken certain steps to rectify this situation, but a much more courageous policy is necessary if Canadian theology is to be delivered from the blighting effects of this problem.

It would appear that we have grounds for guarded optimism. Something has been accomplished; much remains to be done. One final question demands consideration. When we achieve a mature theology, what rôle can we expect it to play? An indigenous theology will not, of course, be independent. The character of Christian thought is such that we ought to bear one another's burdens and to learn from one another's discoveries. Moreover the existence of the ecumenical movement will inevitably increase our awareness of other traditions of thought and our interdependence one upon another. And it is perhaps true that we can draw from Canadian experience in other fields certain inferences which combine to suggest the direction in which we might profitably move. Recent years have seen a notable increase in Canada's status in the world of nations. We have not become one of the great powers; we are what Mr. Pearson has described as a "middle power", and contemporary events suggest that there is an important and distinctive function which can be discharged by nations in this category. They can occupy a mediating and a reconciling position. It may be possible, in God's providence, that we can play a similar rôle in the development of an ecumenical theology. It may be that our outlook and our gifts, as well as our background and our history, qualify us to undertake such a task. No worthier future could be envisaged than one in which we could contribute, according to our measure, to the work of effecting a creative reconciliation between the significant influences either now at work or perceptibly emerging in the great field of Christian theology.

IS PREACHING PROPHECY?

R. B. Y. Scott

THE question raised in the title of this paper is an important one both for Biblical theology and for the modern preacher's understanding of his calling. "Preaching" and "Prophecy" are often in common usage loosely identified, whether the reference be to the ancient Hebrew prophets or to the pulpit ministry of today. The similarities and indeed the real connection between these terms and the phenomena they represent are obvious. Yet the two are not by any means identical. It may contribute to the clearer understanding of both if we seek to define them historically and essentially, to establish the connection and to mark the distinction between them.

Dean Sperry has remarked that Jeremy Taylor's title, *The Liberty of Prophesying*, has stirred the imagination of preachers for three hundred years, so that the custom of speaking of preaching as "prophecy" owes much to "this single happy phrase".[1] Sperry takes as the title of his own Lyman Beecher lectures on preaching the Pauline phrase *We Prophesy in Part*. David A. MacLennan, in his wise and helpful *Preacher's Primer*, speaks of following "in the great tradition of the prophets of Israel", and of seeking "to emulate them as spokesmen for God and his righteousness".[2] This last remark aptly suggests that the identification of preaching with prophecy has been prompted by the rediscovery of the Hebrew prophets as spokesmen of the divine will rather than advance witnesses of the Messiah. When it came to be recognized that the prophets spoke in the first instance to their own times, reproving iniquity, proclaiming the will of God, and calling men to obedience, it seemed that they were in fact preachers. The Christian preacher, conversely, was "prophesying".

The first objection to this is, as Sperry comments, that the pregnant Biblical term may too easily be "reduced to the level of a commonplace professional tag".[3] However real on a deeper level may be the connection between essential preaching and essential prophecy, there is little in common between either the formal modern sermon or the enthusiastic harangue on the one hand, and, on the other, the Hebrew prophet's solemn and costly utterance of the Word of Yahweh. Amos found his whole way of life violently disrupted by Yahweh's imperious summons. Jeremiah was driven almost beyond endurance; wearied in a foot-race with men, he must then, as it were, race with horses. The Word of Yahweh had become within him something like a burning fire which he could not contain.[4] A nameless prophet of the sixth century describes in unforgettable terms the psycho-

logical turmoil and spiritual anguish which he suffered when a divine oracle was struggling to birth within him.[5] We have no right to speak of preaching as "prophesying" unless it is at least comparable with this in its personal involvement of the preacher as well as in the spiritual seriousness of the message.

It can be objected at this point—and quite properly—that like must be compared with like; there was in ancient Israel commonplace professional prophesying as well as what we may call "high prophecy". Yahweh says to Jeremiah that the prophets of peace and prosperity were prophesying lies in his name. He had not sent them nor spoken to them. They were self-deceived, and were proclaiming the fulfilment of their own desires and the desires of those who listened to them. "Attack Ramoth-Gilead and triumph!" cried Ahab's court prophets, seeking to strengthen by a divine sanction the monarch's aggressive plans.[6] In our own day, indeed, it is not altogether unknown for preachers to clothe with sanctity particular policies or a "way of life" grounded more on human desires than on the will of God.

But this again does not get to the root of the question, since the "false preacher" no more than the "false prophet" can be taken as in any way representative. Preaching and prophecy are primary phenomena of the Christian tradition, and can be defined essentially only as they are viewed historically. There is a clear distinction to be made in each case between the function or activity on the one hand, and the resulting message on the other. The proclaiming of the Word is the subjective aspect, and the Word proclaimed the objective aspect. In both there are similarities and differences between preaching and prophecy. The basic similarity is that each is a form of proclamation of the Word of God. In their historical contexts it quickly becomes evident that each term has both a wider and a narrower connotation than the other. In the New Testament preaching has the more significant place, and, in the Old Testament, prophecy.

There can be no question but that the standard or canon of prophecy in the Hebrew-Christian tradition was established by the pre-exilic prophets of Israel. This was the golden age of prophecy. At the same time we know that the term "prophet" or "man of God" in the Old Testament may mean anything from the dervish ecstatic of Saul's day to the stern passionate Amos, the serene Isaiah, the lonely and courageous Jeremiah—or their anonymous disciples who added so much to the prophetic scriptures. Balaam was one, fallen in his trance. Samuel was a "seer" whose "second sight" might be an aid in the recovery of lost property. There were court prophets and temple prophets with whom men like Micaiah ben Imlah and Jeremiah found themselves in conflict. Elisha was a "master" presiding over a college or monastic community, and credited in popular lore with miracles.[7]

It is against this background that the "prophets of the Word" are to be seen, men who refused to prophesy what men wanted to hear since it was

Yahweh who had put the word in their mouth.[8] Micaiah ben Imlah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah the Morasthite—these men were different. Their words were not the incoherent babblings of spirit-crazed dervishes,[9] but conveyed a meaningful message worthy to be received as a Word of God. Their claim to be speaking as Yahweh's mouthpieces, and by his compelling command, is justified, on the whole, by the quality and substance of their utterances.

Before considering prophecy as message we must observe it as an activity. Was prophesying the same thing as preaching? The common notion of the prophets, as itinerant haranguers of the people holding forth to casual crowds in the market place or the city gate, is hardly accurate. The forms of address of many of the oracles make it clear that these were spoken in *representative* public assemblies where secular and religious authorities were present, as well as the people. The nation or community as a collective body was the recipient of the message. "Hear this, O priests! Give heed, O house of Israel! Hearken, O royal house!"[10]

It seems indeed that the principal forum where the prophet's voice was heard was the temple court, where the community was assembled for a stated feast or on a special occasion of fasting or rejoicing. Our only glimpse of Amos in person is on the day when he was ejected from a royal temple for making what was considered a seditious utterance to the people. Isaiah had his vision and his call amid the sights and sounds of worship, apparently when he was standing among the officiants so close to the shrine that he could hear the door-pivots rattle in their sockets. Most probably it was from the same vantage point that he demanded of the congregation, "Who requires of you this trampling of my courts?" Micah's prediction that Zion would be ploughed as a field was recalled when Jeremiah said much the same thing presumably in the same place, the temple court. Many of the oracles of most of the prophets are particularly apt when viewed against the background of an occasion of cultic worship.[11]

It is quite possible, indeed, that some of the prophets whose words have been preserved in the Old Testament were, or had been, officially connected with the shrines. Isaiah, unlike Amos, did not repudiate the title "prophet"; rather, by referring to his wife as "the prophetess" he accepted it.[12] Jeremiah belonged to the priestly family of the shrine at Anathoth; he was called to prophesy while still a youth, and may well have been a cult prophet at Anathoth before coming to Jerusalem. In any case, as we learn from Jer. 36, he had been accustomed to proclaim his oracles in the temple court until, like Amos, he was debarred from the sacred precincts for something he had said. The fact that Jeremiah, Hosea and Micah, found themselves in conflict with the main body of the cult prophets, means simply that individuals of outstanding moral integrity and spiritual perception stood out from the rest.[13]

The prophetic oracles as we have them preserved in writing are in most instances cast in the forms of public address—indeed, in the noble rhetoric

of masters of assemblies. Evidently there is here a close analogy between the activities of prophesying and of preaching, especially if the suggestion be correct that the prophets were discharging the duties of a recognized function in public assemblies for worship. If the activities appear analogous, what is to be said of the forms and the substance? Is a prophetic oracle in its essence the same thing as a sermon?

The prophetic oracle as we find it in the prophetic books may be defined as a divine utterance through the lips of a man who speaks it under a divine compulsion, and not by his own choice. Its content is not what men wish to hear or what the prophet wants to say, but what God wants to say through him. "The Lord of hosts has sworn in my hearing", said Isaiah, "[that] many houses shall surely be desolate".[14] "Thus saith the Lord" means quite simply "This is the message which the Lord has commanded me to deliver". The inference is that the message is being repeated word for word.

At the same time it is quite evident that most prophetic oracles as we have them preserved in the Old Testament bear the marks of deliberate composition for public delivery. They conform to certain established literary structures and are related to other literary forms. At their best they exhibit a powerful and brilliant poetry of speech which clearly was not the product of impromptu composition. It is the substance, not the form, of the message which is attributed to divine inspiration. In Jer. 22:10 and 22:12, for example, we have the same oracle in two forms.

The "word" from Yahweh seems to have become articulate in the prophet's mind as a germinal idea expressed in a single word or phrase. This germinal idea was then clothed in the rich dress of oratory for the occasion when it was to be proclaimed. Amost sees a basket of fruit, (*qayiç*), and exclaims the word aloud; in his ear there is an echo, (*qeç*), "the end". This is Yahweh's Word, and it becomes the spoken oracle: "The end has come upon my people Israel."[15] The famous Isaianic oracle "a remnant shall return" (7:3) is expanded in two different ways in 10:20–23; with the stress on the subject it is a threat, but with the stress moved to the predicate it becomes a promise. Many examples can be given of these succinct "embryonic" oracles and of their subsequent development into poetic and rhetorical forms suited to public presentation.[16]

Almost all of these developed literary oracles belong to one of four classes: denunciation, exhortation, threat and promise. These occur sometimes singly, but more often in combination. They are distinguishable to a degree by their literary structures as well as by their contents. The *denunciation*, for example, often takes the form of a complaint lodged before witnesses ("Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth") or directed to the offenders ("Hear this, you who trample upon the needy"). It may begin "Woe to . . ." or "Shame on . . .". The *exhortation* lays emphasis on a series of imperatives, "Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean". The *threat* usually follows a *denunciation*, and begins "therefore", "truly", or "be-

hold", introducing a declaration of what is going to happen. The *promise* opens with some such phrase as "in that day", or "in the coming days". In each case there is usually a fairly regular structure and a characteristic conclusion. Thus the form of the prophetic oracle, as distinct from its substance, may follow one of several literary patterns. It also bears the marks of the individual style of the prophet by whom it is spoken.[17]

It may be claimed that each of these types of publicly declaimed oracle —especially perhaps the *denunciation* and the *exhortation*—was a form of preaching. The speaker was directing to a particular audience and situation a message of ethical imperatives consequent upon theological affirmations. The message was relevant and urgent because the assembled audience represented the people of Yahweh's covenant. The moral will of the living God was being presented as an urgent demand upon those who claimed his aid and protection.

At this point we become aware of the outreach of prophecy beyond preaching. The prophet did not expound and apply the message of a written scripture or an inherited tradition, even though he stood in a living succession of prophets who shared largely the same religious and ethical convictions. He was speaking on behalf of a God who had indeed, revealed himself to the fathers, but who now had something *new* to say. He spoke *as* (or, at least on some occasions, *as* if) Yahweh had at that moment laid hands on him and put words in his mouth.[18] To utter an oracle is not the same thing as to preach a sermon!

The substance of prophecy is therefore only in part like the substance of preaching. It is the voice of God in a present moment of crisis and decision, a moment in which past and future are somehow included as well. The present is not just a consequence of the past, nor is the future merely a projection of the present. The will and purpose of the living God are the pattern of meaning and the determining factor in all that happens. The prophet points out the pattern and announces what Yahweh is about to do. He articulates the divine purpose, thus constituting history on behalf of the Lord of history. "Surely the Lord does nothing without revealing his secret to his servants the prophets."[19]

When we come to the writings of Second Isaiah, we are in a different atmosphere from that of Amos or Jeremiah, and appear to be dealing with a different kind of prophecy. The difference is not simply in the fact that the prophet is addressing a generation which has now received from the Lord's hand double for all her sins. The spoken word has given place to the written message. Prophecy is merging into poetry, and promise into gospel. "O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings. . . . say to the cities of Judah, 'Behold, your God!' " The imagery of the Exodus from Egypt becomes symbolic of the new Exodus from captivity and despair. Here is salvation; the Lord has been, and is, and always will be "the Holy One of Israel, your Saviour". This is a summons to faith, to hope, to courage and to rejoicing. It is a proclamation of good news, a *kerygma*.

This written prophecy of Second Isaiah, then, is essentially the preaching of glad tidings. It does not come under any of the four prophetic categories of reproach and threat, exhortation and promise. It is an announcement which declares what God has done and is about to do. Surely it is significant that Jesus and the evangelists refer so often to the writings of Second Isaiah, the Old Testament herald of a salvation and a kingdom at hand.

The distinctive quality of the activity which is designated "preaching" in the New Testament is *proclamation*. This is the idea common to the verbs used, viz., *kērussō*, "to announce like a herald", *euangelizomai*, "to bring good news", *diangello*, "to publish abroad", and *katangello*, "to proclaim publicly". Matthew and Mark speak of John the Baptist's heralding a baptism of repentance in view of the nearness of God's kingdom, and the imminent appearance of One mightier than he. Our Lord began here, proclaiming and also exhibiting the powers of the new age to which the prophets of the Old Testament had pointed forward. The apostolic preaching, moreover, declared what God *had done*: "Know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified." It was also a summons to act in the light of the *new situation* created by the announcement, and a promise of what would follow: "Repent, and be baptized, . . . and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."[20]

When the New Testament writers speak of "prophesying", they seem to have in view an activity quite distinct from proclamation of the gospel and the call to respond to it. Essentially the meaning is the same as in the Old Testament, viz., "to speak ecstatically (and, except with the primitive prophets, intelligibly) under the immediate inspiration of God's word". In I Cor. 12:8–10 this is one of the gifts of the Spirit distinct from the utterance of wisdom or knowledge, from "speaking with tongues" and from the interpretation of tongues. Romans 12:6–8 discriminates between teaching, exhortation and prophecy, while in I Cor. 14:3 we read that "he who prophesies speaks to men for their upbuilding and encouragement and consolation, . . . [and] edifies the church". Here "prophesying" resembles pastoral preaching in effect, though evidently what is referred to was impromptu mutual exhortation.

It seems evident from this brief consideration of prophecy and preaching in the Bible that as activities they overlap, but that they differ essentially in the message which it was their function to proclaim. Prophecy was the declaration that the will and purpose of the living God were urgent and relevant in the present moment in which the people stood. God was speaking directly to his people through the mouth of the prophet, revealing the crisis which faced them, and calling for a decision to believe and obey. The emphasis was upon what God was even then doing and was about to do. The note is declaratory and imperative. Let Israel hear and turn again in loyal love to the God whom she professes to serve. Her salvation is not an accomplished fact; it is a promise, conditional upon faith and obedience.

"If you are willing and obedient, you shall eat the good of the land". "In returning and rest you shall be saved."[21]

Preaching, on the other hand, as first exemplified in Second Isaiah and carried forward in the New Testament, was the announcement of good news of what God *had done* and was prepared to do for those who would hear and believe. The announcement is accompanied by an invitation: "Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price!" Whereas prophecy in the name of the Lord of the covenant was addressed to the people of the covenant, preaching was for all who had ears to hear and would hear. Yet it was "to the Jew first", if "also to the Greek". To the former it was the astounding news that God had visited and redeemed his people; that the crucified Jesus was indeed both Lord and Christ. To the latter it was the hardly less astonishing news that what God had done for his ancient people he had done also for all men who would enter into his covenant.

The Christian preacher today is the heir both of the Old Testament prophets and of the apostolic preachers of the Gospel. He is the heir, too, of the priest and the "wise man" who, as Jeremiah tells us,[22] shared with the prophet the task of speaking for Yahweh in ancient Israel. And he has laid upon him the apostle's pastoral "care of all the churches"; he must "reprove, rebuke, exhort" and "make full proof of his ministry".

Preaching, as we understand it in the church of today, is a more inclusive term than prophecy. The terms, as we have seen, are not synonymous in scripture. We should not speak loosely of the preacher as a prophet any more than we should describe him as an apostle. Yet the prophetic office and the apostolic commission both belong to the *ministry* of the church, and to the individual preacher as he represents that ministry and shares its authority and responsibility. Only occasionally—perhaps rarely—does the preacher assume the prophet's mantle. Then he is overwhelmed by a sense of responsibility to utter in a particular situation a "solving word" which he is sure that God has given him to speak. Only twice in a preaching ministry of thirty years, Dean Sperry tells us, did he feel that he was "on the fringes of the experience" of prophesying.[23]

It may well be asked if Christian preaching might not more often have the authentic quality and authority of prophecy if we understood better the nature of the prophetic experience. These men belonged within a theologically articulate religious tradition which had "come alive" in them, so that when they spoke they were not merely threshing old straw. They were personally responsive to the Word of the Living God who had spoken to the fathers and now spoke to them. The Word was not theirs; it was God's. The prophet was God's mouthpiece and his messenger. The Word was a Word of illumination, of rebuke and of summons. The prophet must speak; he could not help himself, for the hand of God was upon him.

In the context of this Biblical tradition we shall not lightly compare—

let alone equate—our preaching with prophecy. We are too familiar with the feeble homily, the dull disquisition, the elegant essay, and sometimes, alas, with the impertinences of the pulpit entertainer. But our preaching may have something at least of prophetic quality if we perceive God's presence and his purpose as the decisive factors in the situation in which we and our hearers stand. Our times call urgently for a prophetic word—a word of clarity, of power and decision, of judgment and salvation. There is an essential connection between preaching and prophecy, and at times one merges with the other. Each proclaims a decisive word from God. In the one case the Word is given to the prophet for publication in a particular moment and set of circumstances. In the other it is a Word which has been given once for all to the People of God, of whom the preacher is a minister. This is the Word of the Kingdom and of the Cross, of the Resurrection and of the Parousia.

To proclaim that "Jesus is Lord" is Christian prophecy which, in the nature of the case, passes beyond the farthest outreach of the ancient Hebrew seers. When, within the total context of Law, Prophecy and Gospel, some truth peculiarly fitted to the moment seizes the mind and soul of the preacher and cries for utterance, he is prophet and preacher too. The urgent declaration of the truth of God is prophecy. The proclamation of the Gospel is prophecy's counterpart and completion.

NOTES

1. Willard L. Sperry, *We Prophesy in Part*, Harper Brothers, New York, 1938; p. 2.
2. David A. MacLennan, *A Preacher's Primer*, Clarke, Irwin & Co., Toronto, 1950; p. 42.
3. Sperry, op. cit., p. 7.
4. Amos 7:14–15; Jer. 12:5, 20:9.
5. Isa. 21:1–10.
6. Jer. 14:14; I Kings 22:12.
7. Cf. I Sam. 10:5–10; Num. 24:4; I Sam. 9:1–10; Jer. 26:7–11; II Kings 4:38; 6:1.
8. I Kings 22:13–14.
9. I Sam. 10:6–10; I Kings 18:28–29.
10. Hos. 5:1: cf. Isa. 1:10: Jer. 2:4.
11. Amos 7:10–13; Isa. 6:1–8; 1:12; Jer. 26:17–19.
12. Isa. 8:3.
13. Cf. Jer. 1:1–10; 28:1–11; Hos. 4:5; 9:7; Mic. 3:5–7.
14. Isa. 5:9.
15. Amos 8:1–3.
16. Cf. Jer. 1:11–12; Isa. 7:3; 8:1–4; Jer. 20:3–6.
17. Cf. Isa. 1:2; Amos 8:4; 6:1; Isa. 1:16; Jer. 22:18–19; 23:2–7.
18. Cf. Amos 7:15; Isa. 6:8–10; Jer. 1:9.
19. Amos 3:7.
20. Acts 2:36, 38.
21. Isa. 1:19; 30:15.
22. Jer. 18:18.
23. Sperry, op. cit., p. 28.

AGAPE AND EROS

A. S. Dewdney

NO one can read Bishop Nygren's great work *Agape and Eros* without gratitude and much delight. This is one of those monumental works of which only a very few are produced in any generation and which help to clarify and mould the thinking of men everywhere. Agape and Eros are words which are here to stay in our theological vocabulary because they express the two great motifs underlying the more inclusive word "love". They enable us to distinguish these elements and to handle them with more precision and understanding of what they mean. All preachers and theologians have suffered in the past in attempting to clarify what is involved in the Christian idea of love, whether it is the love of God to man, of man to God, of man to his neighbour, or the meaning and place to be given to self-love. We now have a clear word for two aspects of what are commonly called love, and for this we must be forever indebted to Bishop Nygren's clear and searching analysis. He has helped us to resolve much of this ambiguity.

Nygren distinguishes two types of love. One is the love of desire. It is the love which values and seeks to possess some good in its object. It is motivated by that good. We love that which is good, that is, that which is good for us. Such a love is self-centred. However lofty the object on which it places its love, essentially it sees that object as a good to be possessed. Fundamentally it loves and seeks its own good. This is the kind of self-centred love which is natural to man. To this kind of love Nygren assigns the name of Eros.

His use of this term is based on Plato's description of love, especially as found in the *Symposium*. Here love seeks for beauty as a form of the highest good. Enjoying glimpses of this good in lowly and sensual things, it is led up from these to seek its highest good in Beauty itself, beyond all entanglement in sense or even in thought. Eros, then, is man's aspiration after the highest good he can conceive. It is a struggle upwards. It is an activity of man. God Himself can hardly be said to love in this sense, since there is no good which he lacks or can desire. Our love is inspired not by any activity of His, but by His own inherent loveliness and desirability. God Himself is Love in the sense of Eros only in the sense that He is Himself His own highest good. Such love as can be attributed to Him is therefore a form of self-love. And in its ultimate analysis this is what Eros always is, however spiritualised its object and form may be.

Men in their natural state know of no other love than this. It is taken for

granted that no one can love another unless he sees in him some good to be loved. If we apply this conception to God, it means that God can only love us in so far as He sees in us something good and lovable. To be loved by God we must earn or deserve that love by our own goodness. Man, therefore, aspires to rise to God's level and to find fellowship with Him upon His own level of holiness and goodness. This is the basis of legal forms of religion such as Judaism, or of mystical religions. They are religions of ascent, by which man attempts to climb up to God's level. Their aim is the enjoyment of Him as their highest good. All religions of this kind, which place the self, its good or its enjoyment, at the heart and which seek to rise by their own effort, Nygren calls religions of Eros.

In contrast to all these is the Christian teaching of love as Agape. Where Eros can only doubtfully be attributed to God Himself, the meaning of Agape is wholly determined by its presence in God. It is the unmotivated love of God, which is directed towards us, not because of any value or worth in ourselves, or because of any good which God is looking for in us, but because love in God is the spontaneous outflowing of Himself. "God revealeth His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." This text is the key to the meaning of Agape. Where natural man would think it immoral to give love and fellowship except on a basis of like to like, God's love knows no such limitation. Its nature is revealed just in the fact that it has no such basis at all. Men naturally love their friends, those who do them good or from whom they expect some good. But men who are filled with Agape will love their enemies. Their love, like that of God, does not find its motive in the character or attitude or value of those loved. It is simply out-flowing, self-giving love which needs no other motive than that it loves.

This Agape then, is the love of God flowing down to us. We cannot deserve it or win it or rise to it. It seeks us at our own level, in our sin, and gives us fellowship. As such it is in complete contrast to Eros, which is man's love and always seeks to rise to God's level. Agape we can only accept. God's love and our fellowship with Him are founded purely on His will, not on anything that we are or that we can achieve for ourselves.

On the basis of this analysis, Nygren then takes the position that Agape and Eros, as the Christian and natural conceptions of love respectively, are completely opposed to one another, and cannot be reconciled. A large part of the work is devoted to the attempt to trace the ways by which these two motifs became entangled and confused during the course of Christian history, and the attempts to create a synthesis of them, in which sometimes Agape, but more often Eros, is the dominant. In the Apologists, in the Greek Fathers, in Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, whether Agape or Eros is the term used, or caritas, amor, or dilectio, the Eros motif has generally captured the centre of the stage. Except as enshrined in the doctrine of Creation and Incarnation and in the Cross, the predominating interest has generally been man's attempt to raise Himself up to God and to seek

for fellowship on God's own level. Not until Luther was it possible to see Agape as containing the only Christian basis for fellowship with God, a fellowship initiated and carried through by Him on our level without any contribution from us. Eros is nothing but man's sinful attempt to set himself in the centre of the picture, on a level with God.

We may be grateful to Nygren for the clear way in which he has differentiated the two concepts of Agape and Eros, and for his clear exposition of what he regards as the fundamental point of difference between Catholicism and Protestantism. Yet we may find reason to disagree with his position that Agape alone is the New Testament and Christian concept of love, and that there is no legitimate place for Eros in genuine Christianity. Here, as in so many other cases, a false antithesis is made, an "either-or" which does not represent the true richness and the real Catholicism of the Christian faith. Heresy is a hard word to use, yet it seems legitimate here. For heresy does not mean false doctrine as opposed to the truth, but rather a part of the truth taken out of its context and set over against other truth. It is the over-emphasis on one aspect as against the "wholeness" of Catholic truth. In this sense, it is not Nygren's distinction between these two motifs, but his acceptance of the one to the total exclusion of the other, that is a mark of his heresy and Luther's if he has rightly interpreted him. Both the New Testament and immemorial Christian tradition demand that a place be found in Christian faith and practice for most of those elements which Nygren rejects as belonging to Eros rather than to Agape.

If we examine the New Testament we shall find little to quarrel with in Nygren's clear and moving description of God's love to man in Christ. The Agape by which God in His bounty reaches down to man in his helplessness and sin is certainly the primary message of the Gospel. So far it is true to say that God comes down in His grace to meet man at his own level. But when we ask what is the purpose of this redeeming movement on the part of God we move into an area of the widest disagreement. Nygren would say that there is no purpose. God's love is wholly unmotivated. It is based only on His will to establish fellowship with us as sinners. He gives the impression that this fellowship, initiated at our level, is to remain permanently on our level. It is a fellowship with sinners, and Nygren seems to imply that if we ceased to be sinners in any real sense then fellowship with God would be impossible.

But neither the New Testament nor the Church since has ever regarded the Incarnation as merely due to the unmotivated love of God reaching down to us. It has always seen in it a *purpose* which is a part of the love of God. The purpose of God's love in Christ is our redemption. But what meaning has redemption unless it means that God reaches down in order that He may raise us up? A relationship between God and ourselves which is brought about by God on our level may be a real relationship, but if it stays at that level, it can hardly be called redemptive. Surely it is God's purpose, not merely to treat us as if we had not sinned, but to deliver us

from the inward power and presence of sin, to raise us to holiness. Nygren may have some place for this thought, but it is not apparent. His whole concern seems to be to show that there is no movement of man from his level of sin to God's level of holiness. There is only a movement from God down to our level.

Such a view contradicts important elements of the teaching of the New Testament. While it is true that the word Eros does not occur in the New Testament, yet many of the elements which Nygren regards as characteristic of Eros are present there. It is not true to say that these entered in only as the result of Greek or other non-Christian influences. If they are due to extraneous influences within Judaism itself, then at least many of them are accepted and taken up into the Gospel. And this fact may justify the Church at a later date in taking up and making her own other elements of the Eros motif. Nygren is fond of quoting Nietzsche's saying that "Christianity involves the transvaluation of all previously accepted values". This is true, but it is a transvaluation of them, and a reintegration of them, not their denial.

Nygren takes the parable of the Prodigal Son as an example of God's Agape toward sinners, so contrary to the common outlook that God could love only the good and holy. Yet this parable would seem a particularly unfortunate one for the purpose. For in this parable it is the son who takes the initiative in returning home. The Father, it is true, sees him a long way off and runs to meet him, freely accepts him in his penitence and restores him to his status as son in the home. But it is the son who comes to his senses and takes the first steps on the homeward path. And the father waits till the son comes in sight. He does not seek him in the far country. Now it is obvious that the details of a parable cannot be pressed too far. And this parable is not primarily told as a picture of God's love to sinners, though it is often interpreted in this way in popular homiletic use. It is a plea to the elder brother who stayed in the father's home to show sympathy and mercy to his erring brother. The basis of the plea is their relationship as children of the one father. The contrast is drawn between the unforgiving spirit of the Pharisees and God's willingness to receive the penitent. But it is not a very clear picture of God's Agape if this consists wholly in the movement of God to seek the sinner at his level. For it is equally a part of the parable that the sinner himself sets out to return to his father's home. On Nygren's terms he is guilty of presumption in thinking to bring himself back to God's level. His only part ought to have been to recognize his lost state and wait for the father's mercy to reach him.

There is another point in this parable of which Nygren can hardly approve. What were the motives which led the son to decide to return? In the beginning at least they were quite plainly self-centred. He is starving and remembers how his father's servants have enough and to spare. This is the motive which sets him on the upward path. Quite evidently he is seeking his own good. This is not even Eros for the enjoyment of renewed fellow-

ship with his father—he does not aspire to more than a servant's status—it is a lower Eros which looks to the satisfaction of the basic needs of physical life. But it is plainly Eros which inspires him. And so far as we are justified in interpreting the details of this parable—certainly so far as Nygren is justified in seeing in it a picture of God's Agape—we can see it as our Lord's acceptance of Eros as a motive which can really and truly bring a man at least part of the way home to God.

Nygren uses the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard to establish once more his thesis that God's treatment of us is based on His free love, not on conventional justice. His payment of the same reward to those who had worked all day and to those who had laboured but for an hour is an indication of this. But while there is a valid point made here, the point of the parable is missed. For again, this parable is essentially a plea to the Pharisees, the men who have laboured all day and received the standard wage, to accept the fact that God's dealings with us are not limited by our notions of justice, and that even the late-comers, the penitent sinners, are assured of their acceptance. But it is an unfortunate example for Nygren's main thesis. For the fact of the matter is that it is those who have worked in the vineyard, whether for a long or short period, who reap a reward. There is no indication that those who never worked at all are treated with equal generosity. The labourers are *expected* to do their part, whether they are called early or late. There is no clear statement here that there is nothing we can do to meet God's demands. And one supposes that the workers in accepting employment have at least some thought of the payment they will receive, an egocentric attitude on their part which should come under Nygren's condemnation as Eros, and therefore not to be given any place in a true religious relationship.

There are many others of our Lord's parables and sayings which stress the same truths. Everywhere we find God's love generous and outreaching to the sinner, fittingly described as Agape. But nowhere do we find any indication that man's search for God, his efforts to obey God's will, his acts of natural kindness and goodness, come under condemnation as sin, even when their motives are not altogether disinterested. Rather it seems that God's love is so great and generous that He rejoices in the very least indication that one of His children is turning towards love and goodness, and that He anticipates and rewards all our unworthy efforts in a manner out of all proportion to their deserving.

It would not be difficult to survey the whole of the New Testament writings, and show that while Agape as Nygren describes it is a very central and important element in the Christian Gospel, yet it is not so exclusive as to leave no room for the recognition of a more human love and aspiration. Nygren has done what Luther did quite consciously; he has taken one element of the New Testament, and made it the standard by which all the rest of the New Testament is to be judged. Thus, even though St. John gives expression to the thought that Agape is so characteristic of God that

"God is Agape", yet Nygren sees something uncertain in his picture of God's love. He suspects that the metaphysical basis for God's love in His love for the Son cannot be regarded as unmotivated by the inherent worth of the Son. Consequently it is not genuine Agape. And he sees the same flaw creeping into the concept of God's love for men, "The Father Himself loveth you, *because* ye have loved Me". Again, in the love of the brethren, which St. John emphasises so often, there is something exclusive and motivated, whereas in pure Agape on his view there is no limit and no motivation in the worth or nature of the object loved.

Criticisms of this kind would seem to show that Nygren has not fully grasped even the meaning of Agape itself. He is continually confusing Agape as God's free and outflowing love to sinners with the relationship that it sets up. The former is quite certainly and rightly regarded as independent of the worth or the response of those who are loved. But a relationship between persons can never be a one-sided affair, even between God and man. Whatever word one uses to denote this relationship, fellowship or communion, there is a flow in both directions. But in Nygren's view the movement is all in one direction, from God to man. In so far as man's response to God can be called love or Agape at all, it consists merely in acceptance, obedience, surrender. There can be no motivation in it in the sense of loving God as one's highest Good, because this makes the self the centre. There can be no movement from man's side towards God's level of holiness, because the whole basis of God's Agape toward us is that it is a love toward sinners. Such a view seems to rule out any growth or deepening of fellowship. In his desire to avoid any trace of human initiative or egocentricity, Nygren seems to rule out any real fellowship. If the relationship is as one-sided as this, then surely God is treating us as mere objects, not as persons with whom He will enter into a fellowship of love. One sees no reason why His Agape should not equally manifest itself to animals and trees and stones.

This suggests surely another fallacy in Nygren's reasoning. His strongest point in his description of God's Agape is that to be Agape at all, it must be wholly unmotivated, uninfluenced by any worth or value in the object loved. Here there seems to be a confusion in his thought. He confuses the idea of moral worth or merit with worth or value in the sense of inherent possibilities and potentiality. In the former sense we can agree with him generally that God's Agape is unmotivated by the value of those who are loved. It is sinners whom God loves, and His love flows out to them in their sin. But in the other sense we cannot say that God's love takes no account of the value of its object. It is just because in every man there is a potentiality for fellowship with God, that God can take him as the object of His love regardless of his present moral standing. This can be clearly seen if we ask ourselves why it is man and not some other of God's creatures towards which He manifests His love. Obviously it is because the animal, the tree and the stone have not the capacity to enter into such a relation-

ship. Whatever we mean by personality, it is evidently something which has a value in the sight of God, because it is the indispensable basis for personal relationship. In this sense therefore it is not true to say that God's love is wholly unmotivated by the value of its object. Yet Nygren denies that Agape is motivated even in this sense. He denies that in man there is any spark of the divine—a way of expressing this idea of man's inherent value derived from Greek thought. In this form it may seem too closely bound to the idea that evil is caused by the spirit's association with matter. But he also dismisses the Biblical concept of man created in the image of God. He will not have any likeness between God and man, because he thinks that the nature of Agape will be endangered unless there is an absolute distinction between them. There must be no basis at all in man for God's love, or His love will be motivated and then will not be Agape. This is to confuse value or merit in the moral sense with the value or potentiality of a nature. The former has rightly no place in Agape. The latter is a necessity for it.

There are two further criticisms of Nygren's position from the point of view of the fundamental doctrines of Creation and Incarnation. These two doctrines Nygren regards as preserving the Biblical doctrine of Agape from being completely obscured by Eros pressing in upon the Christian view from the natural world. He does not see that while these two doctrines do enshrine the doctrine of the love of God in the full and complete sense that he desires, yet they also leave room for a human response and activity which answers to God's love, which responds to it, and furnishes the basis for man's ascent to fellowship with God in His holiness. That is, these two doctrines give a home to elements which Nygren identifies with Eros, and rejects.

Nygren's attachment to the doctrines of Creation seems in many ways to be due mainly to the fact that it is a safeguard against Gnosticism and indeed against all forms of mysticism. In his view these always involve the supposition that in man there is a divine spark which is entangled in matter. Matter is the source of evil and in order to rise to fellowship with God man must rise above his material needs and desires. The way of salvation is therefore by mystical and ascetic techniques. But these necessarily involve man's upward striving for a supreme good. However spiritualised, they are built on self-centred Eros. The doctrine of Creation, however, in affirming God's creation of the material world prevents us from finding in matter the source of evil. It is therefore a safeguard against these forms of Eros-dominated ways of salvation. It is chiefly for this negative reason that he values the doctrine.

It is possible to present the doctrine of Creation in a more positive way as an expression of God's Agape which delights to create for itself objects of its love. But this is not the immediate question. The fundamental question is whether, if God is Creator, and therefore matter which he has created is good, this does not imply that other elements of the created

world are good also. Can we dismiss any element of man's created nature as something altogether opposed to God? Nygren shows how universal an element Eros is in human nature. He shows how in Plato and others it becomes a highly spiritual concept when directed toward Beauty and Goodness. Yet he regards this whole activity as in fundamental and final opposition to Agape, the only true form of love. He sees in its every form a final egocentricity. It is easy to see in this egocentricity only an indication of man's fallen condition. But this will hardly do. While we may recognise that man's highest aspirations and efforts fall short of the goal at which they may aim, yet there is something perverse and spiritually blind in the point of view which dismisses them as wholly worthless and unpleasing to God. The truth is that we must accept man's very egocentricity as a part of his nature as created by God. The child is born, dominated altogether by his physical needs and desires. It is hard to see how this is in any way due to our fallen nature. Rather it seems an inevitable part or stage in human life itself. It is the basis from which the child advances towards higher goods outside itself, and finally to God as the Supreme Good. The doctrine of Creation forbids us to call anything evil which is genuinely a part of man's created nature. If man's nature is created by God then nothing in his nature will be opposed to God's love. Its proper growth may be perverted; it is this distortion that is in need of redemption. But unless what was created by God is totally destroyed by sin, we cannot say that even Eros is wholly incompatible with Agape. Here perhaps lies part of the explanation for Nygren's curious attraction to Marcion; it lies not only in Marcion's strong affirmation of Agape, but in his rejection of our human nature as created by God. Nygren parts with him where he denies God's hand in the creation of matter, but he reveals unconscious sympathy with him in his distrust of the other parts of God's creation.

But it is in the doctrine of the Incarnation that Nygren shows his lack of understanding of the wholeness of Catholic faith. For it is just here that he finds Agape most strongly exemplified, and Eros most strongly negated. And yet, so far as Eros represents that element in man's nature which seeks to find God and strives to please Him by obedience and goodness, we find this too in the Incarnation and the Cross. To Nygren these are wholly actions of God's love revealing itself to men and redeeming them. To him and others of the same school of thought, such as Barth and Brunner, the whole meaning of the Incarnation is summed up in the words "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself", and "God revealeth His love towards us in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us". We would not for one moment deny the reality and the importance, even the primacy of this fact. But we may point out that the incarnate Christ is here regarded from one point of view only. He is God acting in the world. His humanity is only the necessary means which He adopts to meet man on his own level. But this is not doing justice to the reality of the Incarnation. For Christ is truly Man as well as truly God.

If there is in His Being a movement of God down to man, there is equally in Him a movement from man's side to God. Nygren has *utterly* failed to see this side of the New Testament doctrine of the Incarnation. The reality of our Lord's humanity is stressed there, not merely to ensure the fact and the depth of God's condescension to us, but to show that in Him and by His real union with our nature we find the possibility and the means to rise in Him to union with God. There is a whole range of thought in the New Testament, and not least in St. Paul from whom Nygren professes to receive his chief inspiration, which emphasises our Lord's mission as Man through whom we have access to the Father. As the second Adam, He makes the perfect offering of humanity, so that a way is opened by which our upward striving can reach its goal. He is the great High Priest, the one Mediator, who is not only the way by which God comes to man in Agape, but the way by which Eros is fulfilled in man's ascent to God. It is in our union with Christ in His humanity that He is not only identified with us, but we are identified with Him, in His death, in His Resurrection and Ascension. "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." It is in these ways that the New Testament doctrine of our Lord's Person and work fulfils the upward way of mysticism and satisfies the God-given human Eros, refining, purifying, sublimating it, but not destroying it as the real achievement of humanity, since Christ enters as Man into the heavenly places that we might also thither ascend and with Him continually dwell. Here Agape and Eros find their harmony in Him who unites in Himself the divine and the human. There is no denial of the reality of either, nor any final contradiction, though the self-centredness from which Eros takes its start may never be wholly eradicated in this world. In spite of Nygren and Luther, the Church has made no mistake in seeking throughout its long history to do justice to both these motifs. The various forms of synthesis proposed by the Apologists, the Greek Fathers, by Augustine, by St. Thomas may not have found the true intellectual solution; perhaps this can never be finally found; but they were right in attempting to do so. And Luther and Nygren are wrong in attempting to separate them and set them over against one another in fundamental opposition.

THE STUDY OF CANADIAN CHURCH HISTORY

T. R. Millman

THOSE who deplore the slow progress of Canadian church history towards acceptance as an independent branch of study in the academic field may take consolation from the following remarks on ecclesiastical history in general made by Professor Norman Sykes in an inaugural lecture delivered in Cambridge in 1944:

> Whereas the professors of divinity may trace their ancestry to the Lady Margaret or to that majestic lord who, in breaking the bonds of Rome suffered a few doles from the financial profits to fall to the universities, and whilst the regius professorships of modern history enjoy the relatively respectable lineage of two centuries' continuance, the elevation of ecclesiastical history to equal dignity belongs in England to the academic reforms of the nineteenth century.

He then went on to relate that although in Scotland the ancient universities of Edinburgh, St. Andrews, and Glasgow, possessed chairs of ecclesiastical history from the first half of the eighteenth century, yet at that early date the subject was neglected, indifferently taught, and consequently unpopular.

Thus if even in the older homes of learning in Great Britain ecclesiastical history was comparatively late in achieving independent status and distinct professorships, it should occasion little surprise that the story should be repeated in the younger and later developed divinity schools of Canada. Furthermore, if this was the case with the subject in all its breadth and fullness, there should be still less ground for surprise at the slow rise of the much more circumscribed topic of Canadian church history to a recognized place in the theological curriculum.

And yet the subject has much to commend it, and not for the theological student alone. The place of religion in human affairs has been eloquently proclaimed by such masters as Arnold J. Toynbee and Lord Acton. It need not be argued at this late date that the story of churches and churchmen is part of the whole Canadian story, and that Canadian history cannot be fully or accurately represented without giving to the churches a larger place than they have been accorded hitherto. It is evident that in early Canada church and state went hand in hand, and that any attempt to write the history of New France without putting ecclesiastical affairs in a prominent position would be quite impossible. It has not been recognized that the same is true, although to a lesser degree, for the century after the Cession of 1763. A strong attempt was made at that time to reproduce an established church in the British North American colonies, and this attempt

meant that political, ecclesiastical, and indeed economic concerns in these colonies were closely intertwined. This connection is well illustrated by the clergy reserves which are the most striking example in our history of the state endowment of a church, and which were secularized just a century ago. Since the disappearance of church establishments from Canada the separate histories of church and state may be more clearly discerned. Yet the continuing national importance of the churches, and their prominence in helping to pioneer the prairies, the west, and the north, make it necessary for the student of Canadian life to give them full consideration.

The stream of Canadian history has two sources; on the one hand France, the British Isles, and western Europe generally; and on the other the Thirteen Colonies and the United States. Europe is the racial home of the greater part of our population, and these European immigrants naturally attempted to reproduce in British North America the institutions which their ancestors had known for centuries. Hence French Roman Catholics brought at first the seventeenth century fervour of the church of their homeland, the religious orders, some Gallicanism, more ultramontanism. Irish Roman Catholics brought their fierce ecclesiastical loyalty. Anglicans contributed the close cooperation of church and state, the distinctive emphases of the Church of Ireland and the Scottish Episcopal Church, and a tendency to reflect the changing lineaments of the church of the motherland. Presbyterians brought their established church, and in addition many of the ecclesiastical divisions of Scotland. Wesleyan Methodists and other Methodist groups transplanted from Great Britain their characteristic beliefs and practices.

Moreover, most of the religious stocks which came directly from Europe already possessed branches in the Thirteen Colonies, and these American churches strongly influenced their Canadian counterparts. Methodists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians (whose traditions now merge to a great degree in the single channel of the United Church of Canada), Baptists, Lutherans, Anglicans, Friends—all had been more or less Americanized, or were open to American influence in their new northern home. Some sects, indeed, originated in the United States and came to Canada without a European background.

Thus in order to gain a full understanding of the Canadian churches the student should be familiar with the ecclesiastical history of the United States as well as of Europe. With such knowledge he is better equipped to analyze the various ingredients which combine to make up Canadian Christianity, and to learn how the old churches adapted themselves to the new dominion. Indeed, such is the intrinsic value of the subject that it could take its place among the humanities and become one of the roads over which young Canadians might travel to attain a liberal education.

But the story of the Canadian churches should be studied for itself alone, not as a means to any further end. That story does indeed illuminate secular history, and it does require for its better comprehension a broad

background knowledge of general church history, but when read for its own inherent interest it yields rich rewards of instruction and inspiration. The thoughtful student of the subject will discover the truth of Bacon's dictum that 'histories make men wise', and also that such wisdom brings both sadness and gladness. In his perusal of the missionary annals of the churches in this land he will learn what men and women impelled by the Christian Gospel will do for their fellows. The Jesuits of Huronia, the Moravians of the Labrador, the tireless evangelists and missionary priests of the Maritimes and the Canadas, the volunteer clergy who served on Grosse Isle during the cholera epidemic of 1847, the patient, obscure men and women who worked among immigrants, Indians, and Eskimo, in the west and the north, these Christian souls carry on the tradition of apostolic days. Canada, indeed Christendom, should be proud to own them, to read of their works of faith and their labours of love.

But in order to instruct and inspire, records must be preserved and used, books must be written, teachers must be trained, and these aims are being accomplished all too slowly. Theological schools even yet neglect Canadian church history, and their collections of books and pamphlets are thin and poverty-stricken. The universities have done better in gathering materials, but up to a quarter of a century ago postgraduate students who wished to do research in Canadian church history received scanty encouragement. It is not difficult to see why these conditions should have prevailed. The purpose of the theological college is to give basic training to candidates for the Christian ministry, preferably in the shortest possible time. Parishes and missions on pioneer, rural, and urban frontiers must be manned, and studies must be so chosen as to achieve this end. Curricula are crowded, and newly developed courses must jostle and compete with traditional subjects if they are to establish themselves. As for the universities, teachers in graduate faculties were not persuaded of the significance of Canadian church history, and preferred to direct their students to the not yet fully tilled fields of politics and economics. But these conditions are changing. Universities now recognize that the history of the development of Canadian churches is at least as important as the history of any other national institution. Theological colleges now admit that church history did not come to a full stop a century or so ago, and that it is all to the good if their graduates know how Canada came to be a professedly Christian land.

Despite the unorganized state of Canadian church history studies a vast amount of material has been preserved, and much has already found its way into print. Denominational histories and biographies of church leaders put in an early appearance. Examples of these are Bettridge's *A Brief History of the Church in Upper Canada*; Akin's *Rise and Progress of the Church of England in the British North American Provinces*; Playter's *The History of Methodism in Canada*; Patterson's *Memoir of the Rev. James Macgregor*; Richey's *Memoir of the Late William Black.* Lists of works mentioned in Castell Hopkins' *Canada, an Encyclopaedia of the*

Country, and *Canada and Its Provinces* indicate a growth in the number of publications as the nineteenth century drew to a close. Within the present century the flow of printed books, pamphlets, and periodical literature, swelled by reports of regional church organizations such as synods, has increased in volume. When to these publications are added the unprinted theses of graduate students, and the manuscripts in the dominion, provincial, and denominational archives, the materials for Canadian church history are discovered to be wide in their extent.

The Quebec Diocesan Archives, for example, whose contents are catalogued in the Provincial Archivist's report for 1946–47, is an admirably arranged repository and an indispensable source for information concerning the old diocese of Quebec, which covered both Lower and Upper Canada. Nor is it exclusively Anglican in the breadth of its interest; many references to Methodists, Presbyterians and Roman Catholics are to be found in its various series. The Provincial Archives and the Library of Laval University contain part of the wealth of source material available in the Province of Quebec for Roman Catholic church history. Manuscript material relating to the Presbyterian Church in Canada in the Library of Queen's University alone is great in its bulk. From the point of view of scope and richness the Public Archives of Canada at Ottawa is perhaps best of all, and its contents have the additional advantage of being catalogued, and in some cases calendared, in successive annual reports. Toronto may be numbered among important research centres because of the splendid collections of printed and manuscript matter preserved in the Public Library, the provincial Department of Archives, the United Church Archives, the University of Toronto Library, and some college libraries. In eastern and western archives and libraries from Halifax to Vancouver, and in Great Britain, further collections of documents of primary importance are to be found.

Thus the wide dispersal of materials for his work is one of the greatest difficulties in the path of the research student, and these difficulties will continue to exist unless some effort is made to remove them. A historical records survey in church history would be of the greatest value, both as a guide to workers and as a revelation of the greatness of Canada's documentary heritage in this respect. The interim production of papers similar to Nelson R. Burr's "Sources for the Study of American Church History in the Library of Congress" (*Church History*, September, 1953) would be most helpful. This article, it may be remarked, gives a good idea of the amazing labours of American archivists and librarians in this field, and causes the reader to look forward to the day when Canadian educationists will be as thoroughly convinced of the importance of the subject as Americans are. But before a survey can be undertaken and brought to conclusion much cataloguing and classifying must be done, and search must be made for further historical materials which are at present in private hands, or which are hidden away in obscure places.

Canadian church historical works at present available vary in their value. Some are models of their kind, but all are fragmentary. Many are incomplete through lack of source material. Some are inaccurate. Others betray political and confessional animosity. A few are written as if other bodies of Christians did not exist, or as if such existence were irrelevant or annoying. Yet many have a deep interest for the reader, whatever the merits or demerits of a particular volume may be. Some of the older books especially were written by men whose pens flowed more smoothly than those of modern, possibly more scientific, historians. There is a need for many more special studies, parish and congregational histories, constitutional histories, denominational histories, accounts of special missionary, immigration, and educational projects.

But it is idle to expect a continued fruitful interest in Canadian church history until study books have been written, and to this necessary task competent historians should turn their attention. An indication of the kind of book which is called for is given in the words of Professor Herbert Butterfield written some ten years ago:

> The historian seeks in the first place to 'resurrect' something or other that has happened in the past. Uncoiling the cinematographic film he projects for us the people, the stories, the scenes, the events of a chosen period. One half of him seeks to know more about the men and the events. . . . but. . . . another half of his mind strains to discover some meaning in the procession of the centuries, some pattern in the shifting combinations of circumstance. The historian moves forward to other purposes therefore, and his narrative turns into exposition, his pictures acquire depth and structure.

The truth uttered by Professor W. E. Collins of King's College, London, half a century ago should also be kept in mind when such a project is being considered: "Ecclesiastical history cannot be isolated from history as a whole. . . . It is not the history of one section or one element of human life, but of all human life as seen from one point of view." This point of view is, of course, the Incarnation of Jesus Christ, and the extension of the Incarnation in the Church. But even if the wished-for textbooks be deficient in exposition, or if they do not attain the high ideal put forward by Professor Collins, yet some such books we must have if students are to be encouraged to take up Canadian church history seriously. Books written on the lines of William Warren Sweet's *Story of Religions in America*, or *Religion in Colonial America* would be welcome and useful.

The slow but sure permeation of Christendom by the ecumenical spirit presents a new challenge to church historians, including those of Canada. It has already influenced the writing of such a massive work as K. A. Latourette's *History of the Expansion of Christianity*, and the same author's *History of Christianity*, where efforts are made to paint a picture on a global canvas, and to tell the story of Orthodox and Roman Catholic as well as Protestant churches down to the present day. The recently published composite *History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948*, edited

by Ruth Rouse and S. C. Neill, has a similar basis. It should be possible, now that barriers of ignorance and suspicion are being removed, to approach the study and the writing of Canadian church history without giving too much prominence to

> . . . old, unhappy, far-off things
> and battles long ago,

and to recognize gladly what religious groups and churches other than our own have done to create a Christian nation, to build up the Kingdom of God in this land.

Part of the difficulty under which the study of Canadian church history labours may be attributed to a current lack of historical sense. Church builders in the last century possessed this sense. They were conscious of laying permanent foundations for future construction, and they fed their hopes by dreaming of the spacious days to come when their churches, then small and weak, would provide Christian leadership for a great nation. The turmoil of the twentieth century has shortened the views of many, has led them to break faith with the past, to be careless of the records of past achievement, to immerse themselves in the present, and to be sceptical about the future. A revived study of Canadian church history would correct this tendency.

In order to advance the fortunes of this study, archives should be further developed to house what still remains despite accidents, past neglect, and often heedless destruction. People must be encouraged to entrust their church relics to expert keeping. Cataloguing of books and manuscripts must be undertaken. Historical records scattered throughout Canada and Great Britain must somehow be made available for study, either by transcription or microfilm. And since these activities cannot be carried on without money, both private donors and central church boards must be shown their importance. Grants in aid of publications, even if small at first, would bring hope to many a frustrated and discouraged student that the results of his toil would eventually get into print.

In accomplishing these aims the assistance of experts will be needed, but just as necessary will be the aid of those who would not claim that name. Interested ministers and laymen can give great help. The story of two old Anglican congregations on the Quebec-Vermont border will illustrate this. St. Armand East, as mission and parish, has had an existence of one hundred and forty-seven years. For the greater part of this time two successive rectors and their families cherished the parish papers. Today these papers constitute a valued part of the church archives of Quebec and Montreal. In the neighbouring St. Armand West stands a building dating from 1827, long used as a parsonage, and still a dwelling house. Succeeding occupants and owners of this old house preserved the library so well that when it was broken up only a few years ago it represented the accumulation of more than a century. Fortunately these books and papers have also been

preserved, and they come down to the present day in all their fascination because former generations took thought for generations to come. But for two circumstances such as these one may record many instances of thoughtless waste not only of the historical capital of the church but of the whole community.

The thousands of ministers and priests throughout Canada should set about the collection and preservation of their congregational records—registers, minute books, scrapbooks, printed reports, files of bulletins, magazines and church newspapers, pictures, monumental inscriptions—materials, in short, from which a comprehensive parish history could be compiled. If each clergyman would set his hand to write such a history or to promote its publication, so much the better. In no way can one gain a better sense of what is worth preserving and what is not. These collected records should be filed under simple headings, or placed in chronological order in cardboard filing boxes, and these boxes should be kept in a safe or, better still, entrusted to a central archives for security. It is a result of such thoughtful care that collections of documents from the past have been handed down to the present. With little change the glowing words of Joseph Howe might be adopted as a motto by those who have at heart the promotion of Canadian church history:

> A wise nation preserves its records, gathers up its muniments, decorates the tombs of its illustrious dead, repairs its great public structures, and fosters national pride and love of country by perpetual reference to the sacrifices and glories of the past.

THE CHALLENGE OF EDUCATION TO THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

HILDA NEATBY

IT is a platitude to say that we none of us practise what we preach. The assumption is always that we fail to do so from human frailty and that we must patiently strive to come nearer to our theory. No doubt this is sound in general, but it may be an over-simplification. Truth is, after all, not a simple goal that we struggle to reach, but a many-sided thing that we struggle to grasp. The quality of achievement often seems to exist in a kind of splendid inconsistency, in a state of fruitful tension between theory and practice, in the paradox which reveals its truth through contradiction.

There is no need to enlarge on the meaning of the paradox to those who know anything of the glorious paradoxes of the Christian doctrine and way of life. The Englishman Charles Williams, novelist, lay theologian and friend of T. S. Eliot and C. S. Lewis, makes use in one of his writings of the ancient conception of the two ways: the affirmation of images and the negation of images. By the first way every created thing is an image of God and is to be received as such from God "who has given us all things richly to enjoy". All things are of God in Christ and all may lead to God through Christ. This is the affirmation of images. But the Church also follows with St. Paul, for example, the way of rejection of images. "What things were gain for me those I counted loss for Christ." Created things, images, may be idols, and he who accepts the idol denies Christ. Williams insists that both ways must (in some degree) be followed by everyone. In all matters of this world the Christian must say to Christ, "This also is Thou; neither is this Thou". One man may be led to rejection as were many great ascetics who were saints; another to acceptance; but each way must in some sort be practised by all. Of St. John of the Cross whose life was a miracle of rejection Williams says, "Even he, toward the end, was encouraged to remember that he liked asparagus; our Lord the Spirit is reluctant to allow either of the two great Ways to flourish without some courtesy to the other".[1]

The ways of acceptance and rejection have appeared in all the Church's dealings with temporal matters and surely nowhere more startlingly than in education. On the one hand there is the emphasis on the necessity and sublimity of pure faith, of revelation, and of acceptance through an act of grace. And these alone matter; they are life, eternal life. Where, then, is there any place for education? Where is the need for any but purely utilitarian or vocational training? Moreover, the Scriptures are full of

warnings against intellectual arrogance, of reminders of the distinction between knowledge and wisdom. Education, like wealth, may be a snare: "Not many wise men after the flesh are called." One might even suppose that in education the Church had found an image that must be pretty consistently rejected.

We know, however, that this has not been so; that the very reverse has been true. If the Scriptures emphasize that salvation is by the miracles of grace and of faith, so do they also stress the efficacy of preaching and the necessity of instruction in all matters concerning the faith. We are to prove all things. Williams suggests even that we must argue out all things, remarking that God rebuked not the impatience of Job who was sure something was wrong, but the complacency of his comforters who insisted, in the face of the evidence, that all was well.

But the Church has not only approved and insisted on a rational examination of dogmatic truth. It has in addition sanctioned, encouraged and patronized profane learning, and the arts. In the western world, as we all know, the Church was until modern times the centre of all cultural development. The search for truth in every form was the way of acceptance. If all truth comes from God, he may be worshipped by affirmation as well as by negation.

There is, then, in the educational tradition of the Christian Church, before the Reformation and since, this lively and fruitful tension, this essential paradox: education, irrelevant to salvation, may yet be a powerful means of grace; the arts, letters and sciences, vain pretensions of man's contriving, are yet witnesses to the glory of God. Education is at once affirmed and rejected. It is nothing; yet it may be everything.

This paradox, however, became a dilemma in the modern age which has seen an increasingly clear-cut division between Church and State. The division, however inevitable, was unnatural and in a sense immoral and had serious implications for education. No man can serve two masters.

The problem did not grow simpler. As the State became more highly centralized and secularized, State authorities took an increasing interest in the education of the citizen for service. The spread of secular rationalism, the increasing popularity of ideas of liberty and equality, the extension of the franchise, the need for trained soldiers, administrators, and scientists to serve the State, all contributed gradually to bring about the system with which we are all familiar: universal, free and compulsory education provided and enforced by the State. The nineteenth century saw this principle accepted for elementary education in the advanced countries of the western world; the twentieth century has seen the principle extended to secondary education.

These natural and inevitable developments presented Protestant churches with a dilemma that they have not, as yet, faced fairly. In the leading Protestant countries, Britain, Germany and the United States, it may be said that Church and State joined in approval of compulsory elementary

State education: the State, because along with its other advantages, it seemed to be a necessary rational foundation for the exercise of the franchise; the Church (and I am now specifically thinking not of the whole Christian Church but of Protestant churches as a group), because reading would open to the children the Bible containing the revelation of the will of God. One can say that the State and the Church found common ground in a process which seemed to serve what Matthew Arnold called reason and the will of God.

But this education which both Church and State approved was primarily the responsibility of the State and under its authority. In the interests of national unity and efficiency it could not well be parcelled out among the dozens of churches and sects that flourished in England, the United States, and, as settlement extended, in Canada. In England and the United States the Church in some branches asserted itself, declared that education could not be secularized, and retained a measure of authority over the education of its members. Other branches, refusing both positive affirmation and outright rejection of secular education, accepted it as a neutral thing. In the United States the trend has generally been in this direction, toward complete secularization. In Canada, officially a Christian country, there has remained in most elementary schools some official recognition of the Christian religion.

By and large, however, in all these countries public education became separated from religion as the State was, if not in theory, increasingly in practice, separated from the Church. The kind of education offered by the State was in general the rational-humanist or "liberal" type developed in line with the Renaissance emphasis upon the separation of learning from the dogma of the Church. It was intended to dispel ignorance, to form and train the mind, and to provide intellectually those norms and ideals of conduct necessary for the guidance of the good citizen. In theory (in the light of past experience) this was a good education for the individual in a free and secure society.

In practice, however, two things happened. First, liberal education was cheapened and weakened. It was assumed too readily that people could be educated in the mass as bolts of cotton and pigs of iron could be produced in the mass. We have not yet solved the problem of how to perform cheaply and for the masses the process which, at its best, can be compared only with a delicate hand operation. Second, the social assumptions which had formed this system of education were, from similar causes, proving increasingly unreliable. State education which was religiously and even to some extent morally neutral could be received with profit only against the background of a home where Christianity was practised or at least where an enlightened system of ethics prevailed; and it required also, if its deficiencies were not to be revealed, the environment of a community with clearly defined moral traditions.

As the nineteenth century moved into the twentieth changing conditions

and the opening of new areas of knowledge showed how false were the assumptions of a "natural" ethical or moral background for State education. The stable community life where so many essential educational processes had been carried on outside of school was breaking up. The clan-like family which had been a community in itself was disappearing. Many of the values even of the intimate family group were weakened as the family unit became very small. And broken families and slum homes seemed to make a mockery of formal intellectual education. Moreover, just as natural groups with their traditions, their common affairs, their emotional satisfactions were breaking up, psychological investigations were stressing their immense importance in the development of the child and the life of the individual.

The result, if not inevitable, was not surprising. Rational-humanistic education was indicted as at best calculated to produce sharp, aggressive, competitive individuals, and at worst lonely, rejected, frustrated atoms. It was argued that, after all, the teacher should be more interested in the kind of person who leaves his hands than in the kind of knowledge that person has mastered. The statement if not new, is true, even though it does carry a subtle implication of what is not true. On this principle changes gradually crept into the schools, changes of matter and of method, and of aim, changes dictated and sanctioned by the increasingly secular and materialistic character of society.

Most people are familiar with the general character of these changes. The prime motive for work was to be interest, not obedience; its end was to be the fulfilment of the conscious aims of the child, not his sense of any general external law; instead of individuals working separately, responsibly and more or less competitively, understanding and responsibility were to be achieved through the joint activities of a closely integrated group; the product of the group activity would be the child's sense of self-realization through a shared experience, and also through individual success—but success achieved without the spirit of competition. The ideal outcome of this mode of education is the development of such desirable attitudes in the child as will assure his "socialization"—that is, his ability to take his place happily and usefully in society.

There is nothing in all this bad in itself, and yet to those who accept the dogmas of the Christian Church, and to many others it is dismaying. For there is here a neglect at once of reason and of the will of God. The Church had affirmed State education because it both furthered rational enlightenment and opened the way to a better understanding of the will of God which the Church preached. But if education, ignoring moral imperatives and rational decisions, should make "desirable" attitudes and "socialization" in terms of this world its chief aims, must not the Church decide that such education is not an image to be accepted, but an idol to be rejected? Education had been narrow and neutral, but in seeking an apparently broader base, it was becoming too obviously anti-Christian.

This may seem at first to be an extreme and uncharitable statement. Setting aside differences of detail between schools of thought, it is important to consider what is the essence of the new tendencies. Essentially, it seems to me, what is being attempted is to preserve Christian values without Christian dogma. Christians, because they approve Christian values, have been slow to offer even obvious criticisms. All the new procedures which I have mentioned have a curiously familiar ring. First, children are to work from interest, not from blind obedience—of course; just as Christians are to do the will of God from the heart. Again, children are to follow their self-conscious aims, rather than any external law; just as Christians also are under no law, but know a "service which is perfect freedom". Children are to achieve their objects through the integrated group; and Christians, all members one of another, are to look, not to their own things but to the things of others. Finally, the sharing, the self-realization, the sense of success without competition, are the values claimed by members of the body of Christ who together "grow up to the measure of the fullness of His stature".

Why, then, it may be asked, should Christians, and the Church, be concerned at a philosophy of education which apparently after the manner of the Christian Church sets aside a rigid legalism in order to build children into groups for the purpose of developing socialized attitudes? The Church must be concerned for the obvious reason that the secular group is a body without a head; and it is a body whose members make no use of the means of grace, no claims on the power and goodness of God, who show no recognition of the truth of God and no obedience to His will. From the Christian viewpoint there can be no corporate group claiming (as the school group does) a *total* moral absorption of the individual except by Christian revelation and grace. Failing these we fall back, as individuals, on the law and by the law we are convicted.

The tendency of the new philosophy is to set aside on the one hand absolute law, or reason; and on the other to set aside Christian revelation and grace. Those who accept the philosophy know what they need; and they are following methods which are very old, and which in the Church have achieved admirable results. But these methods are not the sole and necessary cause of these admirable results. Groups are powerful things; and group dynamics are not to be scorned. They are even to be feared. They will not, however, of themselves lead to virtue any more than to knowledge.

Modern education is seeking the fruits of virtue and of Christian love without any concern for the roots. Many, including modern scientific inquirers, are offering evidence of their want of success. A recent writer quotes a psychiatrist as saying that "the chief problem of people in the middle decade of the twentieth century is emptiness", and that "there is a god, or rather a demon they are trying to appease; it is the spectre of loneliness which hovers outside like a fog drifting in from the sea". The

conclusion is that man's only resource is "to cultivate freedom and inner strength".[2] But members of the Church know that freedom and inner strength, with the love that can alone make these qualities safe for society, cannot be achieved merely by contriving group integration and seeking desirable attitudes.

For Christians the essential question is to determine the challenge to the Church in the face of this inescapable problem. Perhaps the answer may best be found by drawing up a list of further questions which look less like a challenge than an indictment: questions on the current relations of Church and State, on relations between the Church on the one hand and the school and society on the other, on the relations of the Church to members of its own flock. These questions apply to the whole Church but with special force to members of Protestant communions.

The Protestant churches accepted and supported State sponsorship and control of a system of largely secular education. Few people would question the rightness of a decision which, as I have suggested, was based on the assumption that the rational-humanist education contemplated would not only cultivate the reason but would make possible a fresh understanding of the will of God. But one must ask whether these churches reminded themselves that from the Christian viewpoint this is only a conditional good, an image which the Church must reject as well as affirm? Moreover, did they sufficiently bear in mind their responsibility to follow the State schools with prayer, and with study, support and advice, and to seek to use education as a means of grace? Have they fulfilled the citizen's duty of supporting and promoting all desirable changes, and of examining all proposals of change and improvement in relation to their implications for morality and religion? In particular, have they concerned themselves with the principles and materials of instruction in schools and in teachers' training schools?

The answer will be that Protestant churches and their members did not do these things and, as a rule, for what seemed like very good reasons. Sensible people realized the danger of silly meddling, they were satisfied that the position of the schools was at worst neutral and at best benevolent, and, finally, they admitted that denominational differences made joint action difficult.

The reasons were excellent. Therein lies the dilemma. The fact remains that tens of thousands of young teachers *knowing no philosophy of any kind* have been introduced to an educational philosophy based on the assumption that belief in God is not only irrelevant but harmful to the educational process. In one large Canadian training school, at least, students used, or were using very recently, a text which professes to be "unique" in presenting all schools of thought, a text in which "idealism" (a philosophy of education which allows belief in God) is given relatively little attention as "it is of interest chiefly to parochial schools". The Church as a whole—and that means every Christian who is a citizen—has a duty

to consider whether such tendentious instruction, if it cannot be checked, should not lead him even to consider sending his child to "a parochial school".

There are also good grounds for questioning whether Protestant churches have sufficiently considered their collective obligations to the school and to society. Have they realized the growing difficulty of the schools, faced with children morally and emotionally unready for the enrichment and the discipline of their minds? Have they separately and collectively done all in their power to maintain homes and communities which, by making their proper contribution, leave the schools free to devote time and energy to their special task of training the mind? Have they not rather acquiesced in the general permission and even injunction to the schools to do and to be everything for the child?

If answers must be given in general terms, I think they would have to be "no" to the first two questions and "yes" to the third. Just as the schools were increasing their bias against traditional morality and religion, they were tacitly encouraged by the Protestant churches to take an increasingly totalitarian view of their functions.

Finally, the Protestant churches have apparently assumed that while the school would attend to things of the mind, specific instruction in religion was the responsibility of the home and the Church. Such an assumption should have inspired vigilance and constant concern for religious instruction. Have our churches seen to it that (so far as lay in their power) *all* children and all parents had such a firm and complete grounding in the Scriptures and in the essentials of Christian dogma, that no matter what happened in the schools there would still be a solid core of instruction based on the will of God, and on reason as well?

The answer here is obviously No. All teachers of literature know that today Scriptural allusions, like classical ones, are a stumbling-block to their so-called Christian students. I, myself, when I taught a beginners' class in French literature had as a rule to depend on my Jewish students to tell the class something of the character and exploits of the man whose name is the title of De Vigny's *Moïse*.

The Protestant churches, I believe, must plead guilty to having betrayed the cause of the Church. I do not mean that they have wilfully injured the State or society, but rather that they have failed in the individual and collective witness which all Christians owe to society. The challenge remains. Christians as individual citizens have a direct responsibility in this matter, and so has every branch of the Church. Appropriate action is needed in three areas where all Christians have or may have information, interest and influence.

It is needed first in the school. I have written in general terms of the philosophy and methods which seem to be approved for the modern Canadian school. As we all know, however, there is much variety of practice and I am now more certain than ever that there is much confusion

of philosophy. I think that it is desirable and that it should be possible to demand from Canada's educational leaders a clear statement of educational philosophy. Now that the aims of the school are so much more ambitious and far-reaching than they were when universal State education was being sketched a century ago, is the philosophy of education as taught still consistent with the claims of reason and the will of God? And I do not think that the almost inevitable statement about an eclectic philosophy should be accepted without further investigation.

If a clear statement on Canadian philosophies of education can be secured, one might well ask whether they are really in accordance with the convictions of the majority. A contemporary American writer has stated quite bluntly that many American schools profess a philosophy which, in his view, is contrary to the beliefs and wishes of the parents concerned; that is, he charges that the operations of American schools are not only unchristian but essentially undemocratic. It may be that such a situation exists in our own country.

It may be, however, that most Canadians approve a philosophy which the Christian Church could not accept. If so, the Church might still inquire whether in such matters as the emphasis on sports and extra-curricular activities, and on guidance in all its forms, and in many other matters, minority rights receive sufficient consideration. And, if it is ascertained that they do, the Church must still consider, on the one hand what measures it must take to protect its young people from an education of which it cannot entirely approve, and on the other how it may best give sympathy, support and encouragement to the many things that are good in the work of the schools.

Action is also needed to influence Canadian education within the organization of the Church itself. I have already raised the question: What are we doing with our children and our young people? I will not use an over-worked and a misused term and ask whether the Church is child-centred. It is, however, appropriate to ask whether of all the auxiliary rooms in a church the Sunday school rooms are the most attractive and convenient and the best-equipped. It is also proper to ask whether every member of the congregation and particularly those charged with the government of the Church make it their business to know the children and to encourage the teachers. In short, is the Church showing itself in the care and training of its children to be a group which is not merely integrated but which has and owns a Head?

And finally, the same questions must be asked about Christian families. Are they truly Christian in their group life, and are they helped in their supremely important educational task by the Church? Should it be left to psychologists, good and skilful as they may be, to tell parents how to treat their children with love and sympathy? Also, should not some one tell them how to use the findings of psychology in Christian teaching and training? This is done frequently by the clergy in at least one Christian communion

which is not Protestant. Why do Protestants trail behind? Is it because Protestant parents will not listen, or because the leaders of Protestant churches are less concerned with parents' responsibilities?

The Church, and particularly its Protestant section, is faced today with an educational process which seems to employ Christian modes, too often forgotten or neglected by us, but without any recognition of Christian revelation or Christian grace. These modes may well meet superficial needs, but by so doing they cover over the true needs which they do not recognize and cannot satisfy. It is for the Church in all loyalty to a free and democratic society to work honestly, consistently and humbly to make reason and the will of God prevail. The true challenge here is the same as on all other fronts: to show not only a form of godliness, but a power.

Notes

1. *The Descent of the Dove*, p. 281, quoted in *Theology Today*, July, 1953, "Charles Williams: Lay Theologian."
2. *Times Literary Supplement*, February 19, 1954, p. 125.

CHRISTIANITY AND COMMUNICATION

F. W. Dillistone

I

SCIENTISTS assure us that the second Industrial Revolution has begun. The first was brought about by the expanding use of the machine and the multiplication of manufactured goods. Man dedicated his labour to the service of the machine and in return gained possession of increasing numbers of mechanical appliances and manufactured articles. He did not cease to be dependent upon the land and the products of the land: he was not unmindful of the need for improved communications in order that his goods might be advertised and distributed: but the whole drive of his energies was set in the direction of making more efficient machinery and of producing larger quantities of goods.

The twentieth century, however, has witnessed a startling change of emphasis. When the history of this century comes to be viewed in proper perspective it will probably be judged that the most powerful instruments of change in human affairs during this period have been the aeroplane and the radio. Each is essentially an instrument of communication. By means of the aeroplane man can span the continents in hours rather than days or weeks; by means of the radio his voice can be heard around the globe with no delay in transmission. But these two instruments, though at present the most obvious and most dramatic in their effects, do not stand alone. On every side men are bending their energies in the direction of improving still further the means of communication and of conveying 'information' in more efficient and economical ways.

Though it is comparatively easy for the layman to take advantage of the amazing facilities now offered to him by the telephone, the cinema, the radio and television, it is more difficult for him to grasp what is happening in the wider world of communication theory and practice. He may read about electronic 'brains' and automatic factories and guided missiles but these may seem at first sight to be only new examples of the inventive genius of the scientific age. They are new inventions, it is true, but they are more than this. They are expressions of the new direction of technology towards efficiency of communication rather than towards efficiency of production. They are the heralds of the second Industrial Revolution which may change the habits and outlook of men in this age as profoundly as the first affected men in the 18th and 19th centuries. To quote one assessment of the new situation contained in an article designed for the non-expert and

appearing in the London *Times* of December 7th, 1954: "Practically everything depends to some extent upon the efficiency of communications, for information passes along all such systems, electrical, mechanical or human; it flows through the nervous system of the animal body, and in the body social is the vital basis for all activity. . . . Man's advancement and the progress of civilizations have depended on his ability to receive, to communicate and to record his knowledge. With the ever-increasing flow of information, to-day's claim on these facilities—applied to a still wider field —is greater than ever before and efforts to improve and extend them are the goals of scientists and inventors in this country and elsewhere."

II

Have these new developments any importance for the Christian Church? Using a New Testament phrase I would answer: Much every way. They have a direct bearing on the Christian doctrine of man (is he ultimately to be compared to an electronic brain?), on the Christian doctrine of society (can social trends be predicted and pre-directed by means of statistical computations?) and above all on the Christian theory and practice of communication. It has often been pointed out that the spread of early Christianity was due in no small measure to the network of road-communications which had been magnificently engineered by the Roman technicians and to the existence of the Greek *Koine*, providing a means of reaching the minds and imaginations of the common people. Nothing can be of greater concern to the Christian evangelist to-day than to determine what are the most significant instruments for conveying information to our modern world and what are the language-forms which have the widest currency in ordinary speech.

Leaving aside the question of the transmission of more technical information, the great new fact of our time in the field of communication in general is undoubtedly the growing influence and importance of television. In a recent number of the B.B.C. *Quarterly*, Dr. B. Ifor Evans, distinguished man of letters and Provost of University College, London, writes: "Television itself is still in its very infancy. Within ten years, given normal possibilities of development, it will be the major instrument in our cultural life. . . . Television is so brilliant a medium that it must occupy increasingly the leisure of those to whom it is available." In similar vein a noted public figure in England has described television as "probably the most important influence on the human mind since the invention of printing". Already there are signs of revolutionary changes in the techniques of political electioneering and debating as this medium is brought into use, and the worlds of education and commerce are being increasingly affected by it. Quite certainly the Christian Churches cannot afford to neglect the challenge and the potentialities of this most powerful means of communication.

But what is essentially *new* about television? Many of its properties are

possessed by the radio, many by the cinema-film. But the radio can only make its appeal to the ear, and in spite of the fact that in a limited number of cases communication may be made most effectively without reference to or dependence upon the eye, in general, as Ifor Evans remarks, "the eye and the ear together are irresistible". Again, while it is true that the movie-film can appeal both to eye and ear, it suffers from two limitations. It is normally shown in places of public assembly and does not make its impact upon the family-unit in its own home. (There are indeed certain group effects produced in a cinema which could not easily be paralleled elsewhere.) Secondly, it cannot reproduce pictures of the living present: that which is shown on the films deals either with the past or with the world of the imagination. Thus television covers a wider range of human experience and appeals to a wider range of human sensitivities in the ordinary settings of life than does any other medium of communication at present in use. It could perhaps be urged that a skilful public speaker or a clever actor would appeal to a wider range of human emotions than is possible for the man who appears on television: at the same time the continuity and the variety and the outreach afforded by television are such as no single speaker or actor could possibly command by the use of individual resources alone.

III

Having glanced at the present situation in the world of communications let us go back to the basic question which the Christian evangelist must ask: "What am I commissioned to communicate?" It is too simple to answer: The Gospel. What are the essential features of this Gospel? Without analysing in detail the *Kerygma* to which reference has so often been made in recent New Testament studies, we may affirm without hesitation that this *Kerygma* is concerned with a Person and with something that this Person has done. In traditional Christian theology it has been usual to deal first with the Person of Christ and then with the Work of Christ, and although this distinction can easily be pressed too far, it yet corresponds to the New Testament concern with the Names applied to Jesus on the one hand and the descriptions of what He achieved on the other.

In a sentence which is surely one of the most impressive in the whole Biblical testimony, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews declares: "God who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers through the prophets has now at the end of these days spoken to us through a Son." God's communication to men has been made through a Person who is Son of God, Son of Man, Servant, Son of David, Word of God, Wisdom of God, Image of God, Christ, the Lord. But in another deeply impressive testimony St. Paul declares: "God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not reckoning their trespasses against them." The achievement of this Person, the achievement which must be communicated to mankind, is variously described as salvation, redemption, justification, expiation, reconciliation. Thus God's communication is made,

as it were, through two channels neither of which can ever be independent of the other. One may be described as personal unveiling, the other as dramatic activity: one as disclosure of Eternal Being, the other as initiation of radical change. To emphasize the one at the expense of the other has always led to distortion and ultimately to serious error in the course of Christian history.

But what are some of the deeper characteristics of the two channels to which we have referred? The *Person* of the Son immediately suggests continuity of life, extension of being, maintenance of form. Sonship is not a relationship suddenly acquired or suddenly lost: it belongs to an individual throughout the span of his particular career—indeed it precedes it and continues after it. So the New Testament speaks of the (eternal) Holy Spirit through whose operation the Son of God took human nature upon Himself and expressed His Sonship in human form. By so doing He made it possible for men to *see* the true nature of sonship. Perhaps other senses are also involved but primarily we *see*. "He that hath seen Me (the Son) hath seen the Father." "We beheld . . . the glory as of an only-begotten of the Father." "The life (of the Logos) was manifested and we have *seen*." "The light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face—or Person—of Jesus Christ." In short, God has made His communication through a Son in order that we may *see*.

What then may be said of the other channel? The *Work* of the Son immediately suggests change, re-direction, a momentous reversal. A hostile and estranged humanity could not be transformed by any light and easy process. The Son of Man must suffer, must be utterly identified with man in his lost-ness, must die. So the New Testament speaks of the eternal (Holy) Spirit through whom the Son of God offered Himself once for all, dividing all time and every time, changing *in potentia* the whole human situation. *Now* the good news is released that the deed has been done. "We do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." "We are heralds of Christ as though God were appealing through us. We beseech you in Christ's stead: Be ye reconciled to God." In short, it is for all men to *hear* the communication of what God in Christ has done for mankind.

IV

In the light of this sketch of the theological background of Christian communication, it becomes possible to work out certain principles which govern the Church's responsibility in any age. In the first place there must be the continuing disclosure of the Person of the Son before the *eyes* of men. They must be enabled to *see*. It is true that there is a form of inward vision which may not seem to be immediately dependent upon outward perception: it is also true that words can bring vivid pictures to the human imagination. Yet these two forms of seeing can never make the primary form of direct vision unnecessary or redundant. At every period of Christian history, if communication is to be effective, there must be certain great

objectivities related to the Person of the Son of God which people can literally *see*. It need hardly be said that nothing can more effectively disclose Divine sonship than the individual or the community whose pattern of life bears upon it the stamp of the incarnate Christ. A Stephen, a church such as that of Corinth, which could be described as a 'living epistle', brings vividly before men's eyes the pattern of the sonship to which all have been called and to which, by God's grace, all may be conformed.

But man lives not only in the immediacy of the present. By the images which he constructs he constantly seeks to universalize the vision which he has seen. So through painting and sculpture, through architecture and the mystery-drama, he seeks to placard openly before his own eyes and the eyes of his contemporaries the objectivities and stabilities of the pattern of sonship which has been revealed to him. It is significant that the image of the good Shepherd bodied forth this vision before the eyes of the early Christians in days of persecution. Or again, speaking of the mystery-plays of the 15th century, Emile Mâle says: "I should find it difficult to believe that anyone listened with much attention to the metaphysical discourses of Justice and Mercy or to the long sermon preached by John the Baptist. But to see Jesus in person, to see Him live and die and rise from the dead before their very eyes—that was what moved the crowd even to tears." And I myself would be prepared to add that such a film as *The Robe* is doing for our twentieth century what the mystery-play did in the 15th. The media already mentioned go on from age to age, changing in some measure according to the climate and the techniques of a particular period, but all concerned with the task of enabling men to *see* the nature of the sonship which God has revealed to men.

In the second place there must be the ever-renewed proclamation that the supreme event of the ages has happened through Christ. Men must *hear* the good news. Again it is true that there is a form of inward hearing which may not seem to be immediately dependent upon physical sounds: it is also true that the printed page can transmute itself into virtually audible words as it makes its impact upon the perceptive organs. Yet the spoken word shows no signs of becoming obsolete. If Christian communication is to be effective there must, in every age, be the open proclamation that the Christ has changed the whole course of human history and the whole nature of human destiny. Again it need hardly be said that nothing more impressively proclaims this change than the living witness to an actual re-direction from sin to holiness, from self to God, such as have been given by a Saul of Tarsus or a Church of Thessalonica. When men proclaim that as a result of the work of the Christ they have themselves turned from idols to serve a living and true God, others begin to realize the unparalleled proportions of the initiating event.

But there are symbolic extensions of the word as well as of the image. Through *forms* of speech—the lecture, the sermon, the drama, the ballad,

the hymn, the open-air address—the Christian evangelist has sought in different ages to proclaim the news of the great Event to his contemporaries. Each of these forms has its own conventions and techniques and it brings no honour to God to neglect or ignore these necessities of effective communication. For example the acoustics of a particular building may make easy hearing impossible: an oration is quite unsuitable in a lecture-room: a poem may be quite unadaptable to singing: a seventeenth century sermon could not be imitated in its form to-day. Perhaps the most obvious example of changed technique to-day is the radio talk. Anything in the nature of declamation or the flight of oratory or the intense emotional outburst is quite out of place on the radio and is a complete deterrent to effective communication. The radio is the most amazing instrument yet invented for the extension of the human voice so that one man's announcement can be heard by millions. If the technique of the radio talk can be mastered, it seems to be the supreme means offered by the 20th century of enabling men to *hear* the good news of what God has done in Christ.

V

So far we have kept seeing and hearing apart so that the particular relatedness of each might appear more clearly. What finally is to be said, however, of the media of communication which work through eye *and* ear, through the image *and* the word? How great, for example, is the debt of the Reformed Churches to the invention of printing which was revolutionizing the world of communications in Europe in the 16th century! Through this marvellous medium it was possible for men not only to hear the word but to see it, to retain it for further consideration, to interpret it by seeing it within its context. It is true that at first sight men of that day may seem to have *seen* little more than a collection of abstract symbols. But in the case of the Bible in particular (and in a measure this is also true of the great myths and epics and legends of antiquity which were becoming available) the language so often corresponded directly with scenes and places and incidents and so often drew vivid pen-portraits of persons, that through reading the Bible men found themselves looking out upon the hills of Palestine and even catching glimpses of the Son of God journeying from Galilee to Jerusalem.

Since the invention of printing, other devices have facilitated the extension of the word, while the increasing skill of the photographer has made for the rapid reproduction and distribution of the image. But now at length the medium has been discovered by which word and image together can be instantaneously conveyed and reproduced within wider and wider circles of human life. Much has still to be done to improve transmission and to perfect reception, but there is little doubt that ultimately it will be possible for a person in one part of the world to receive both a visual impression and a verbal message from almost any other part of the world.

Surely no medium ever yet discovered offers greater possibilities to the Christian evangelist as he seeks to extend the communication of the Image of God in Christ and of the good news of what God has done in Christ.

Not that this new medium puts all other means of communication out of court. The importance of the person to person encounter and indeed of the communication from an individual or a small group to a limited community in a familiar setting cannot possibly be exaggerated. Here is the indispensable medium for final and decisive Christian communication. Yet there are these other means, at a lower level of intensity, at a wider range of outreach, but all in some way preparing the ground for the kind of final communication which touches a man at the very depths and limits of his existence. These other means capture the interest, stimulate the imagination, open doors to adventure, offer a way of richer experience. And of these none is so powerful as that which can convey both the animated symbol (the cartoon) and the pattern of living experience (Live Action) into the very homes of the people. It may be suggested that the cartoon is the modern equivalent of the New Testament parable and could be used for the same purpose: certainly, the parallel to the 'mighty works' which Jesus performed and which enabled men to see a new power working in their midst could be provided by examples of Christianity in action in our contemporary world—televised programmes revealing before men's eyes that the power of the living Christ is still operative in human life.

Experiments are waiting to be made, techniques are waiting to be investigated. It is altogether doubtful whether television is the best means for communicating certain large aspects of Christian truth and certain critical proclamations of the Christian gospel. At the same time the Christian Churches dare not let this new and most powerful medium go by default. This is not a time for new buildings: nor is it a time for the creation of new institutional machinery. It is a time rather for ensuring that as 'information' of all kinds courses through the world's channels of communication, the most important 'information' ever given to man shall not be left out. The task is supremely difficult. But it is still possible where men are so moved by the Divine Spirit that they cannot but communicate the things which they have seen and heard.

THE JOHN HENRY BIRKS COLLECTION OF ANCIENT PALESTINIAN MANUSCRIPTS

R. B. Y. Scott

PRINCIPAL F. Cyril James has announced the acquisition for the Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, through the munificence of the John Henry Birks Foundation, of a collection of manuscript fragments of the Old Testament and related works dating from the beginning of the Christian era and earlier. These will be of the utmost importance for the study of Judaism in the time of Christ, and for the study of the Old Testament text. They are part of a find made in a cave known as "Qumran Cave Four" in the Judaean Desert near the Dead Sea in September 1952. Most of the remainder is in the hands of the Jordan Government and the Palestine Museum. The Faculty of Divinity collection will be the largest outside of Palestine. It was obtained for McGill by purchase from the Bedouin who made the find, as a result of prolonged negotiations conducted by the author with the Department of Antiquities of the Jordan Government. The Director of the Dept. of Antiquities, G. Lankester Harding, F.S.A., has declared that the genuineness of the documents is beyond question, and has written to "congratulate the University on having acquired what is certainly the finest collection of these unique manuscript fragments outside the original Government collection".

Since the accidental discovery in 1947 of the famous "Dead Sea Scrolls", including a complete copy of the Book of Isaiah, five other caves containing parts of the library of a Jewish sect, apparently the Essenes, have been found in the same vicinity about ten miles south of Jericho. The ruins of the sect's community centre at Khirbet Qumran have been excavated by British, French and American archaeologists. The most extensive and important finds were made in what is now known as "Cave Four", and of these about one quarter have been obtained for McGill. Smaller collections have been purchased by Manchester University and the Vatican Library. They will remain at the Palestine Museum in Jerusalem (Jordan) for about two years for classification and study.

The excavation of the community centre at Khirbet Qumran by Father R. de Vaux of the École Biblique in Jerusalem has demonstrated conclusively that it was occupied by the sect from the second century B.C. to the First Jewish Revolt, as a result of which Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans in A.D. 70. Evidently on the approach of Roman armies the "Essenes" were dispersed, after concealing their library in surrounding caves so well hidden that some were not discovered until the twentieth

century. Ancient authors record similar discoveries in the same vicinity in the third and in the eighth centuries A.D. In the community centre have been found the remains of a "scriptorium", with a table, inkpots and a basin apparently for ritual washings; here evidently some at least of the newly found manuscripts were copied by the scribes from older examples.

The fragments of the John Henry Birks Collection are still in process of being cleaned and identified, so that it is not yet known what it comprises, except that there are included both Biblical and non-Biblical manuscripts in Hebrew and Aramaic. The material previously acquired by the Jordan Government from the same cave includes parts of every book of the Old Testament except Chronicles, and also commentaries, paraphrases, apocryphal works (some previously unknown), together with ritual documents of the Qumran sect.

These finds, of which McGill has been so fortunate as to acquire a significant portion, will throw a flood of light on the history of Judaism in the post-Maccabaean period, and on the crucial epoch of the rise of primitive Christianity. In addition, they give glimpses of the form of the Old Testament text a thousand years before the copying of the Hebrew scrolls from which our English Bibles and other translations have been made.

BOOK REVIEWS

Peter: Disciple—Apostle—Martyr: A Historical and Theological Study. By Oscar Cullmann. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953. Pp. 252. $4.50.

The problem of St. Peter and his standing in the primitive Church is not merely one of academic interest. In the New Testament two epistles are ascribed to him, the second quite definitely wrongly; he has the honour in Acts of being God's original choice as the missionary of Christ to the non-Jewish world; and in all the early traditions he occupies a place of peculiar pride. This comes out most clearly in the famous passage "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). Since it claims that Peter became the first bishop of Rome, the Roman Catholic Church asserts that Peter's successor, the Pope, has succeeded to all the authority and privileges of the Apostle. So the Peter problem concerns the basic Protestant-Catholic controversy, the foundation of the Church, the meaning of Apostolic Succession and the intention of Jesus. But the strange thing is that we have so few careful, scholarly studies of the Prince of the Apostles, and for that reason we must all be the more grateful to Professor Cullmann of Basel for this very able book.

The first part (pp. 17–152) considers the strictly historical question regarding Simon Peter as a disciple of Jesus, an Apostle in the earliest Church and as the great Martyr. There can be no doubt that Simon was one of the first disciples and that it was Jesus who gave him the name "Rock", Cephas or Peter. The Synoptic Gospels exhibit Peter as the spokesman for the Twelve, but distinguish this position from that held after the Crucifixion. "He appears only as the most representative of the disciples." The risen Lord, however, appeared first to Peter and must have renewed his commission (1 Cor. 15:5; Mark 16:7); hence Peter acted as head of the primitive Jewish Christian Church. We see him chiefly as a missionary (e.g. Acts 8:14) and soon his office in Jerusalem passed to James, the Lord's brother. Both Peter and Paul interrupted missionary work to attend the Jerusalem Conference of Acts 15, over which James presided. Gal. 2:12 proves that Peter was dependent on Jerusalem, whereas Paul was relatively independent.

Peter visited Antioch and may have been in Corinth. He may also have gone to Rome because of the internal troubles in its mixed Gentile-Jewish Christian community. The view that Paul sent for him is not impossible (p. 106 n. 34), but a Roman residence is proved rather by the fact of a Roman martyrdom. For the death of Peter at Rome Cullmann adduces 1

Clement 5, which he links with Phil. 1:15–17, 1 Peter 5:13 (Babylon stands for Rome) and a few other scraps of evidence (Mark 15:10, Rev. 11:3, and the strange silence at the conclusion to the Acts). Not everyone has been convinced by Cullmann's exegesis of the "jealousy" passage in 1 Clement, but the present reviewer finds it convincing and illuminating. Paul and Peter were martyred at Rome, partly because of information laid by fellow-Christians (cf. Tacitus, Annals XV. 44). But there is no evidence that Peter spent a long time in the capital or that he could have been its bishop (the silence of Ignatius is eloquent). The recent excavations at the Vatican are examined carefully and the conclusion is that the grave of Peter cannot be identified. But the excavations suggest that Peter was executed in the Vatican district.

With the exception of a short section on the doctrinal concepts of the Apostle (pp. 65–69), this completes the first part of the book.

After a lengthy enquiry into the history of the exegesis of Matt. 16: 17–19, Cullmann answers the questions posed by the material as follows: the saying to Peter is a genuine word of Jesus, but it belongs rather to the context of the Last Supper than to Caesarea Philippi. Peter is the foundation Rock of the Messiah's covenanted People, the remnant: Peter in his own person and not Peter's faith. For ecclesiology is inescapably tied to Christology: the Messiah must have his community (a *qahal* or *kenishta*) and the Twelve are the prototype of it, engaged to build it up by their missions both before and after the crucifixion. Jesus must therefore have looked some way into the future. What is absolutely out of the question is that Jesus intended the foundation-laying of the Church to go on indefinitely! Peter is the Rock who has no successors (p. 207). Protestants are thus bound to agree that Peter is their foundation too and that the whole Church must be Apostolic. Rome, however, falsely claims that Peter's power to declare forgiveness and to teach the original community has passed to her bishop. For the succession could not pass from Jerusalem under James to Rome or Antioch or any other see under Peter. The proper place to find the continuity of the Apostolic authority that witnesses to Jesus Christ as divine Lord is not in the episcopacy but in the canon of the New Testament scriptures.

It is impossible to enter into all the questions raised by this book. One would like to know precisely what sort of headship Peter exercised at first in Jerusalem and whether the emergence of James meant a succession in the physical line of the Messiah's family. It is not clear that Peter was dependent on Jerusalem nor that he was as close to Paul's position either as a universalist or a theologian as Cullmann suggests. He is entirely right in pointing to the covenant conception at the Last Supper and to the Twelve as underlying the intention of Jesus that a community of some kind should survive and should preach the gospel of the Kingdom. I am unconvinced, however, that the saying, "Thou art Peter and on this Rock I will build my church (*qahal*)" can belong to the Last Supper where Peter is warned

that Satan will try him, or that in its present form, even with *qahal* or *kenishta* in place of *ecclesia*, it is a genuine word. The rock in Judaism was Abraham or the Messiah, as in Paul (1 Cor. 3:11), and I should prefer to think that Jesus as the Son of Man, the servant Messiah, was the Rock on which God's Kingdom is built.

One must warmly commend this important book for its irenical tone and its sober historical scholarship. It ought to be studied and pondered in every manse and study.

The English translation by Dr. Filson of Chicago is competently done, though there are several examples of poor translation-English. I have noted mistakes on the following pages: 48, 56, 61, 64, 71n., 85, 96 n.3, 116n., 125, 129, 148, 161, 163 n.23, 167, 170, 187 n.95.

George Johnston

Emmanuel College
Toronto

Love, Power and Justice. By Paul Tillich. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. Pp. 127. $2.25.

The influence of Paul Tillich on modern theological and secular thinking in America and Europe continues to grow with the publication of each new book. His name is fast becoming a by-word in intellectual circles, both clerical and lay.

This increasing influence is due not only to the profundity and originality of his thought but also to the catholicity of his interests and his penetrating grasp of the problems which afflict modern man. In the opening pages of this book he points to the fact that the three fundamental concepts with which it deals, Love, Power and Justice, "appear in decisive places in the doctrine of man, in psychology and sociology, they are central in ethics and jurisprudence, they determine political theory and educational method, they cannot be avoided even in mental and bodily medicine" (p. 1).

If a philosophical theology, such as Tillich's is, can analyze problems and offer creative attempts at their solution in such diversified fields of thought and action, it is significant thinking, regardless of how valid in details one may consider it.

The author thinks that the root meanings of these terms and their relation to one another can be arrived at only on the basis of ontological analysis, that is, only through the attempt to answer "the simple and infinitely difficult question: 'What does it mean *to be*? What are the structures common to everything that is, to everything that participates in being?' " (p. 19). Such an analysis will yield the insight that Love, Power and Justice are a trinity of structures in being itself: essentially they are united in being; actually, in existence, they are separated and conflicting.

There is nothing that *is* which does not have being on the basis of *Power* to be. Being means the power to resist and overcome the threat of non-being. Being therefore can be described as the "power of being" conquering or taking into itself "non-being". Moreover, everything that is is "living", for life is "being in actuality" and *Love* is the "moving power of life" (p. 25). Love is the power which drives toward the reuniting of the separated. *Justice* is what preserves the being of that which becomes reunited with other "beings" through love. It is then "the form in which the power of being actualizes itself" (p. 56); it is "the form in which and through which love performs its work" (p. 71).

These abstract descriptions of being are clarified in their application to personal existence. Every person, to be person, must participate in the "power of being". But to be person also means to be driven toward union with other persons. This is the power of love at work in human life. Love is the power which overcomes all that separates a man from his fellowmen (as well as from himself, for Tillich holds that there is such a thing as self-alienation and self-reconciliation). Justice is the form of love; that is, the union between separated personal beings, achieved through love, cannot be such as to destroy the being of those who are united. Justice is what preserves the being of the person whom love unites with the other, or others. Anything which tends to destroy the personal being of someone, while attempting to unite him with other beings, is destructive and must be denied in the name of justice. Nor should one will to sacrifice his own being in surrender to another out of a mistaken understanding of the nature of love. Such a sacrifice destroys not only him who makes it, but him also who accepts it. Without the justice which affirms and seeks to fulfil the being of the self, as well as that of the other, there is no reuniting love, because there is nothing to unite. The love which unites and the justice which preserves those who are united are essentially one in being itself.

So also are power and love essentially united. "The basic formula of power and the basic formula of love are identical: separation and reunion" (p. 49). Under the conditions of existence power must actualize itself through compulsion and force. These aspects of power are not in themselves antithetical to love or justice; they become so only if, in their purpose to unite the separated, they negate justice and work so as to destroy, rather than affirm and fulfil, the being of those whom love seeks to unite. Force and compulsion, used to restrain and destroy all that is against love, are actually performing the strange work of love.

The relevance of such an analysis to contemporary problems, both in the realm of personal and social ethics, including politics, will be apparent. This should be so also with the concluding section of the book. We have already seen that, although love, power and justice are in their essential nature united, in existence they are actually separated and conflicting. So Tillich raises the question: "How can their essential unity be re-

established?" In his answer he passes from philosophical analysis to theological affirmation. Their essential unity is re-established "through the manifestation of the ground in which they are united" (p. 108), i.e. through the manifestation of Being itself, which is God. "Love, power and justice are united in God and they are united in the new creation of God in the world" (p. 115). This new creation in the world of estrangement Tillich calls "the holy community", the Church. "In the holy community love, power and justice in their ontological structure are affirmed but their estranged and ambiguous reality is transformed into a manifestation of their unity within the divine life" (p. 116).

There are a few comments of a critical nature that one might raise with the author. It is difficult to understand from his discussion what is the "cause" of separation of that which belongs essentially together. Love is the power which reunites the separated; is it also the ground of separation, as a doctrine of "creation out of love" might maintain? The development of Tillich's thesis does not lead one to anticipate this answer. At one point he actually describes separation in terms of a "fall": "Actualization of one's potentialities", he writes, "includes, unavoidably, estrangement; estrangement from one's own essential being, so that we might find it again in maturity" (p. 112). The same is implied in another statement: "Whether one says that being has non-being in itself or whether one says that being separates itself from itself and reunites itself with itself, does not make any difference" (p. 49).

In this connection the author does not clearly state whether "separation" always means "estrangement" or whether "reunion" always means "reconciliation". These problems become most acute in attempting to understand the religious meaning of the triune nature of God. God is, for Tillich, symbolically speaking, the living God who actualizes his being in love because in Him also there is separation and reunion. "In his Son, God separates Himself from Himself, and in the Spirit He reunites Himself with Himself" (p. 107). But precisely here we must ask: If love is described as the power of reunion, what is the ground of separation? And do separation and reunion in the Godhead mean estrangement and reconciliation? If not in God, why does it "unavoidably" in man who is made in the divine image? What is needed here, we would suggest, is a somewhat clearer differentiation between love as the power of reconciling the estranged and love as communion between the separated.

Moreover, is there an implicit contradiction between Tillich's two statements, (1) "Being which includes non-being is finite being," and (2) " 'Finite' means carrying within one's own being the destiny not to be" (pp. 38–9), and his other statement that God—symbolically speaking—includes in his being an infinite amount of non-being? (p. 40). Even symbolically speaking it is difficult to think of God as finite, carrying in his own being the destiny not to be!

Some will find very questionable the implication in parts of the book

that one can have knowledge of God as He is in Himself, and can create symbols more or less adequate for the expression of His being, in independence of Christian revelation. The latter at one point is treated as a particular instance of knowledge of God derived elsewhere. In speaking of God overcoming estrangement by taking it upon Himself, Tillich writes: "This is the meaning of the age-old symbol of God participating in human suffering, a symbol which in Christianity was applied to the interpretation of the Cross of Him who was said to be the Christ" (p. 113).

Finally, in this book, as elsewhere in the author's writings, "revelation" is spoken of as "manifestation of the ground of being" rather than in terms of divine self-disclosure through divine action in history. It is an interesting question whether love, power and justice might not take on somewhat different symbolic meanings if they were interpreted, in the light of the Scriptures, as symbolic ways of speaking about God's action and only derivatively about God's being. For example, it may well be that there is a dimension to the forgiving love of God that is not quite expressed in the sentence, "Forgiving love is the only way of fulfilling the *intrinsic claim* in every being, namely its claim to be reaccepted into the unity to which it belongs" (p. 86, italics mine). The biblical understanding of "grace", it would seem to the reviewer, is such as to transcend even the creative justice which accepts the unacceptable, on the basis of forgiveness, to fulfil an intrinsic claim to fulfilment. The forgiveness of God is born of a love for him who has forfeited every such claim to fulfilment and the justice inherent in that acceptance is the atoning death of the Christ which "satisfies" the requirements of *holy* love.

Despite these criticisms—if they are valid—it is good to read a book such as this in which there are no wasted words but only words of weight and power. Only he who is hidebound to a shallow liberalism or a rigid orthodoxy will fail to gain understanding of philosophical and theological truth, together with much practical wisdom, from reading this book. And even the liberal and the orthodox must be challenged by it to make an equally serious attempt to answer the crucial problems of our time.

Emmanuel College
Toronto

William O. Fennell

The Teaching Ministry of the Church. By James D. Smart. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954, pp. 207. $3.00.

In view of the comparative poverty of really good writing in this precise area of curriculum theory, it is refreshing, in *The Teaching Ministry of the Church*, to come across a book which is noteworthy at once for the consistency of its theological point of view and for the clarity and vigour of its English. Dr. Smart is already conspicuous both as a writer and as a builder

of curriculum, and his six years as editor-in-chief of the new Presbyterian "Faith and Life" Curriculum in the U.S.A. give to his statements as a theorist, and his general strictures on Protestant Christian Nurture, concreteness and authority. He writes as one who was trained in Canada but whose most significant contribution to the relation of theory to educational practice has been in the United States; and his book therefore has a wide area of relevance.

H. Shelton Smith's *Faith and Nurture* (1941) was a deliberately iconoclastic work which now may be said almost to mark the end of a period in religious teaching. Though its criticisms of the American Protestant movement in religious education were shatteringly negative, it is now beginning to produce positive fruits; and *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* is one of the best of these. Indeed in this reviewer's opinion it is the only really consistent—and therefore largely satisfying—attempt to work out a theory of Christian Nurture on the basis of a Biblical and theological concern. With respect to consistency it is comparable only with the uncompromising psychologism of Ernest Ligon, though in other respects the writers are diametrical opposites!

The general thesis of Dr. Smart's book is that the educational problem in the Church is fundamentally a theological problem; that the ultimate determinants of Christian Nurture are theological rather than psychological in character; and that since Christian teaching is one form of the ministry of the Word, adequate principles of Christian teaching can be worked out only in terms of the Church's theological activity, i.e. in terms of its critical understanding of itself in the light of Biblical revelation. He is convinced that the teaching function is rooted in the nature of the Church and belongs to the Church as a whole; and that the Church has not yet taken seriously enough the ministry of teaching. A basic assumption is that "what is done in the educational program of the Church today should be a valid continuation of what was done by Jesus with his disciples". (See whole of paragraph, p. 84.)

Exception must be taken to the use made of C. H. Dodd's distinction between the kerygmatic and didactic aspects of the Church's activity in New Testament times in *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. In characterising the didache as essentially "ethical instruction", Dodd, he maintains, "has done nothing less than detach the work of teaching from all essential relation to the *Kerygma*" and "validated what is actually one of the chief sicknesses of education in the Church" (pp. 21–22), i.e. its prevailing moralism. The fact of the predominance of moralism in the religious education movement can be accepted, but to father its more recent manifestations on so reliable a Biblical scholar as C. H. Dodd is surely an error. In his other writings C. H. Dodd makes it abundantly clear that there is an inner *nexus* between the teaching activity of the Church on ethical matters and the content of its *Kerygma*, e.g. *The Bible Today*, p. 82: "the direction of Christian action . . . is always to be determined by

reference to what God has done for us in Christ." This is very different from the moralism of a Ligon.

The sources of a satisfactory theory of Christian Nurture are partly psychological in character. Dr. Smart acknowledges this in stating that "the deportment of Christian education—must bring the entire discipline of theology to bear upon the educational problem, and, in its exploration of what it means for the Church to be an effective educational agency in the service of the Word, it must not only be ready to learn from those who are investigating the fields of educational psychology and technique from a secular point of view but must conduct its own careful researches in the light of its own objects and aims". What is the precise relation of educational psychology to Christian anthropology in Christian Nurture? This is really the crux of a nurtural theory that recognises the relevance of educational procedures and of psychological research in the interest of Christian ends. The line of enquiry is a fascinating one, but the impression left by Dr. Smart's book is that the understanding of man contained in the Biblical revelation is a sufficient psychological equipment for the Christian teacher. The chapters on "Education and Theology" and "The Growth of Persons" do not throw sufficient light on this intricate question and leave one therefore unsatisfied, and the one on "Re-definition of the Goal" is not complete redefinition, but a theological restatement which leaves some of the more complex problems of educational theory unexamined.

Apart from the two questions of (*a*) the working out of a relation between ethics and faith for Christian teaching, and (*b*) the achievement of an effective connection between theological *foundations* and psychological *description*, the book is extremely satisfying as a contribution towards the redefinition of principles for Christian Nurture.

Emmanuel College
Toronto

JAMES R. GUTHRIE

Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament. By RONALD S. WALLACE. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd (Toronto, Clarke, Irwin), 1953. Pp. xii, 253. $4.25.

THE theological renascence of our time has drawn much of its inward power from a return to the sources of the major traditions of Christendom. In every communion biblical and patristic studies have fostered a sense of the breadth and continuity of Christian theology, while Augustine and Aquinas, Luther and Calvin, Hooker and Maurice, have come alive as teachers of the great themes of Christian doctrine, and theological thinking has been stimulated and enriched through a fresh use of their creative ideas.

In his valuable book Mr. Wallace has tried with, notable success, to let the greatest systematic theologian of Protestantism speak to us on a

fundamental issue of Christian thought. Starting from a study of Calvin's biblical *Commentaries* (the richest source for the exposition of his doctrine of revelation), but without neglecting the *Institutes* and other writings, Mr. Wallace has produced a lucid statement of Calvin's doctrine of the means of grace. His plan is comprehensive enough to include Calvin's treatment of man's relation to God and of the Church as the sphere of that relationship, as well as his view of scripture and preaching, of baptism and the eucharist. The first five chapters discuss man's knowledge of and communion with God and the place of Christ as the sole Mediator between God and man, under both covenants, and thus provide a useful introduction to the problems of "biblical theology". After a chapter on "word" and "sign" in the Old Testament, the remainder of the book is devoted to the word, written, preached and accepted by faith, and to the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist as seals of the word. The meaning of Calvin's doctrine of the primacy of the word is fully stated, but due attention is also given to his "realistic" interpretation of eucharistic communion. The exposition is so careful and objective that theological criticism has to be directed at Calvin himself, rather than at Mr. Wallace!

My only serious criticism of the latter really implies a request for a second book, devoted to assessment rather than to exposition. For example, this book has raised again in my mind the problem of the compatibility of Calvin's theology of sacramental union, influenced by the Greek Fathers, with his emphasis on revelation and the word as primary categories of God's self-communication to man. Can it be that a coherent doctrine would require either (as his more radical contemporaries believed) a lower doctrine of the sacraments or (as his Catholic critics have held) a higher estimate of the role of the sacraments in the life of grace? It would be interesting to have this problem treated by such a competent Calvin scholar as Mr. Wallace.

We should, however, appreciate what we have already been given. Theologians in the Reformed Churches will find in Mr. Wallace's book a dependable synthesis of the thought of their great patriarch on one of the central issues of the Church's life, while those of us who stand outside the Reformed tradition will learn something of its positive teaching, and at least will be helped to disagree more intelligently and fairly.

Trinity College
Toronto

EUGENE R. FAIRWEATHER

Christian Doctrine: A One-volume Outline of Christian Belief. By JOHN MACKINTOSH SHAW, D.D. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953. Pp. 372.

STUDENTS of theology owe much to theological thinkers who have led them through the field of theology, in *Summas* extending to many volumes. Made aware by these works of the vastness of the field, they could greet

with "What effrontery!" the attempt to compress the body of theology into one volume. Yet the attempt has many times been made and to good effect; it has brought forth useful books under such titles as *Outline of Christian Theology, Dogmatics in Outline* and various others. Dr. Shaw's book is another of this order; it essays in a single volume a comprehensive view of Christian doctrine. And it succeeds as definitely as the others in showing that this which it seeks to do can be done.

One of the hazards in offering a full conspectus of theology in one book is that the work produced will be an "outline" of the several doctrines which reveals in the case of none of them its substance and richness. How much better a monograph—or a series of such—in which each doctrine is presented in turn in something of its fulness and depth. This, however, is not one's feeling on rising from Dr. Shaw. It has not been a course in cursoriness or superficiality; but at each step one has had unfolded to him the real matter of the division of theology being considered. And it is done by one who has a sure divination of what in each several doctrine is basal and essential. Because of this, and aided by his mature and thorough scholarship, Dr. Shaw satisfies the critical reader completely in his choice of emphasis in the construction of each belief.

One who tries to write theology does so always under a Cross. On the one hand, what he has to say is given to him; his task is to set forth the Christian Faith as actually confessed. He is not explaining or commending some contrivance of his own. On the other hand, he is a thinker in his own right, and his work will be alive through his writing his own thoughts, and have merit from the quality of those thoughts. How is he to blend these two: the exposition of what theology itself connotes, and the products of his own creative mind? To say that the theologian writes from within the Faith and witnesses to it, so that his testimony and the Faith are *ex hypothesi* a unity, and his thinking can be at once from the Faith's assumptions and characteristically his own, hardly gives the answer. For his *self*-identification with the Faith only demands the more his best personal effort in the explication of it. Dr. Shaw has resolved this dual liability of the theological author in a way that shows his sure grasp of theological method. He is true to the "Rule of Faith", but discloses and records with daring the course of his own insight. An example is his treatment of eschatology. All are aware that the beliefs in this field which Christians hold in common leave many unresolved issues. Dr. Shaw elucidates the commonly held doctrines, then appends his own understanding as it reaches beyond them; for example, when he makes his own choice as between universalism and conditional immortality (pp. 361–2). He invokes in behalf of this choice, along with God's exhaustless grace, the other ultimate of man's inalienable freedom, while he continues man. Whether we follow this particular leaning of Dr. Shaw's thought or not, his venturing by way of it does instance his reconciliation of our two principles: the intellectual freedom which is proper to the theologian, and

fidelity to the Word which is the existence of all theology. Our author is—as every theologian should be—the scribe who brings out of his treasure things new and old.

Thus, in this one-volume *Outline of Christian Belief*, the doctrines of the Church receive all that their sources and historical purpose make germane to them, but are illumined as well from the energy of the personal thought of one who has spent many years in fruitful reflection upon them. All is done with pleasingness of style and freedom from cumbrous jargon, not common in theological writing. The combination of clear expression and command of theology's stores of truth and meaning stamps this book as one of unique value, not only for the minister and the teacher of theology, but, as the author desiderates in his Preface, for all who have a thoughtful interest in its themes.

Dr. Shaw is a Scottish-Canadian theologian who during most of his active years has taught theology in two of our Canadian Colleges, Pine Hill in Halifax and Queen's Theological College, Kingston. The *Canadian Journal of Theology* delights to include in the book list of its first issue this work from his pen, and it does so from the certainty that the book is destined to a sure place in the annals of Canadian theology.

J. Line

Emmanuel College
Toronto

CONTRIBUTORS

THE REV. GERALD R. CRAGG, PH.D., D.D., is Pastor of the Erskine and American United Church, Montreal, and is the author of *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason.*

THE REV. R. B. Y. SCOTT, PH.D., D.D., is Professor of Old Testament, Faculty of Divinity, McGill University, Montreal. He is the author of *The Relevance of the Prophets.*

THE REV. A. S. DEWDNEY, M.A., B.D., is Lecturer in Liturgics at Montreal Diocesan College. He has written a number of articles upon Liturgics and Systematic Theology.

THE REV. T. R. MILLMAN, PH.D., D.D., is Professor of Church History at Wycliffe College, Toronto. He has written biographies of Bishop Mountain and Bishop Stewart.

MISS HILDA NEATBY, LL.D., is Professor of History in the University of Saskatchewan. Her recent publications are *So Little for the Mind,* and *A Temperate Dispute.*

THE REV. CANON F. W. DILLISTONE, M.A., D.D., is Chancellor of Liverpool Cathedral, England, and was sometime Professor of Systematic Theology at Wycliffe College, Toronto, and later at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts. His best-known books are *The Significance of the Cross, The Holy Spirit in the Life of Today, Revelation and Evangelism,* and *The Structure of the Divine Society.*

IN FUTURE ISSUES

Among the articles shortly to appear in the Journal:

The Transformation of the Idea of the Church in the History of early Christianity, by R. BULTMANN (guest article)

Major Themes in the New Testament Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, by the REV. GEORGE JOHNSTON

Asking Questions of the Canadian Past, by PROF. JOHN GRANT of Vancouver

The REV. F. NICHOLS has contributed a survey of the state of the Church in Canada

PROF. R. C. CHALMERS, Halifax, and the REV. NEIL SMITH, Toronto, have written articles on Canadian Church History. Expository articles by DEAN N. H. PARKER and PROF. ELIAS ANDREWS are forthcoming

DEAN J. S. THOMSON, of McGill, and PRINCIPAL JOHN MCINTYRE, of Sydney, Australia, will discuss different aspects of Bultmann's theology. The REV. E. JOHNSON writes on Christian Missions

From outside Canada, there will be articles by CANON T. O. WEDEL, and CANON ALAN RICHARDSON.